

THE
CROZER QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1929

ISSUED BY THE

Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary

SPENSER B. MEESER, *Managing Editor*
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, *Business Manager*

CONTENTS

	PAGE
NEW POETRY AND PREACHING. Gaius Glenn Atkins	137
PRESENT-DAY TRENDS IN AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM. Everett Carleton Her- rick	151
CHRIST'S RESURRECTION: Delusion, Illusion, or Hallucination? William J. Thompson	162
NEO-UNIVERSALISM. Lee S. McColleston	170
THE NEXT STEP IN AMERICAN EDUCATION. Stewart G. Cole	178
WHO IS ORTHODOX? Not a Creedal Shibboleth, But a Spiritual Principle. Spenser B. Meeser	196
WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE	206
ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES. I. G. Matthews	208
NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS. Spenser B. Meeser	
Chain-store Religion	215
Spiritual Values in Philosophic Discipline	217
Finding a New Religion and Losing One's Soul	222
Worship and Religion	224
WHAT'S WHAT IN THE MAGAZINES	228
BOOK REVIEWS	232

Printed for CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY by
THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA

Price, 40 cents. Annual Subscription, \$1.50, post free

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, April, 1929, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

Vol. VI

APRIL, 1929

No. 2

NEW POETRY AND PREACHING

Professor GAIUS GLENN ATKINS

Auburn Theological Seminary

THERE has hitherto been a more than passing coincidence between the essence of poetry and the subject-matter of preaching. Homer tuned his lyre to the stormy music of the jealousy of the Olympians, Ovid and Hesiod sang of such misty beginnings of gods and men alike as they knew, Dante dealt with the time-less fruition of life in nether and celestial fields. It is possible to construct a possible body of divinity from Shakespeare without doing him too much violence. John Calvin made John Milton possible. The basal problem of Goethe in Faust is the basal problem of theology; Wordsworth made pantheism lyric, Tennyson's noblest poem grapples the question of immortality, Browning has always been the preachers' poet.

The relation between such poetry as this and preaching is sometimes as evident as an apt quotation and sometimes more subtle, being found only in some general unity of spirit and purpose. They are both methods of interpretation. The poets' method is generally the finer art—a poet ceases to be a poet when he begins to preach, he is more freely sensitive to that haunting suggestion of "something still more deeply inter-fused," which it is the poet's task to find and voice. There is

in all things from the dust to the stars a strange mingling of reticence and revelation. They hint that they have a story to tell which we would do well to hear. They quicken our curiosity, they move us with a vague unrest. We have only just put it all aside as a foolish fancy when they speak again, and some accent of the eternal and the infinite, pulsing through their tone, quickens the old pain.

Just when we are safest, there's a sunset touch,
A fancy from a flower bell, some one's death,
A chorus ending from Euripides,
And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears.

It does not matter whether you pluck a flower from a crannied wall, listen to a bird sing or the laughter of a child, contemplate the agony of a soul, or face the elemental mysteries of life, there is neither fact nor experience which does not demand interpretation, and poetry and preaching are the great interpreters. They have this in common then to begin with: each takes a fact or an experience, seeks to fathom its deeper meaning and to interpret it in the light of great hidden verities which it at once reveals and conceals.

I

Preaching has, of course, the more definite field of interpretation; it explains origins, relates conduct, defines consequences, appeases conscience, vivifies ethics, and widens spiritual relationship. Its sources are in the Bible. Its methods are for the most part formulated. It is governed for the most part by an inherited rubric. But it is still invested with the atmosphere of the infinite and eternal. It seeks the passage through which our little landlocked bays of life may be flooded with an ampler tide, and opens a way from the shadowy silence of the soul to the white splendor of the throne of God.

The field of poetry is vaguer and more elastic. Its range of interpretation is as wide as life. Its method is the method of imaginative intuition. It is free and primal. It takes the

common things of the wayside and the hearthstone, and beneath its magic touch they change and glow. Through its syllables one hears the accents of the enduring, and along its paths one comes into the presence of a vaster beauty. The poet is creator, not by the power of a lawless imagination but by the right of a creative vision. He sees what other men want to see; hears clearly what they strain to hear, and his noble speech possesses the veracity of our own experience. Does he pluck a flower from the crannied wall—it becomes a microcosm—rooted in the whole vast reach of things and holding, if one could turn it, the key to the mystery of the human and divine.

Does he hear the voice of the wind across the sea—"Well roars the storm for him who hears a deeper voice above the storm." Does he look across the happy harvest field, the pain of fruition, fills his verse with an immortality of unshed tears. Does he hear the Phœbe in the gray dawn—the bird becomes a voice as old as time. Does the incoming tide break in crescent waves at his feet—then his soul, like a ship at anchor, strains and tugs with thoughts inarticulate and dumb and elementary longings. Does a singing girl pass on her one holiday along a city street, the creative imagination of the poet alters a dozen destinies by the power of a simple song while the girl goes on, unconscious that great repentance, quickened patriotism, redemptive love, a vivified conscience, and her own salvation have all waited upon her singing.

Does a friend die, the poet follows his changing moods charged with continuing faith and love until he comes to immortality. Is the story of an ancient Roman murder trial picked up at a city stall, each actor is made to tell his story interfused with his own personality until in the narration the many-faceted jewel of humanity is turned flashing fire and blood, and unquenched love, and sullen selfish hate, and untarnished purity.

Is the leader of a faction in an old Italian town driven into exile—forthwith he peoples heaven and hell with his co-

patriots and shows the horizon of eternity wide and motionless about the little stage upon which these machinations of a day are played out. The relationship of such poetry as this to preaching is a commonplace.

But the right relationship between poetry and theology is more intimate than mere relationship of purpose, it is also the relationship of attainment. In their one task of interpretation, poetry and preaching reach a common goal.

All noble poetry comes home to God at last. It does not matter where it starts or with what task. If its interpretation is final and sincere, it reaches in the end the divine and eternal. Poetry at its finest stands with theology to witness that there is neither voice, nor vision, nor heart-throb, nor desire, nor obedience, nor way of service, nor truth, nor beauty which does not, if you see its true interpretation, its final and comprehensive relationship, lead to God. Whether imagination cleave her swift way, or intuition leap toward the goal, or reason win successive steps, the end of all sincere interpretation is a certainty of God beyond which men can not pass, on the hither side of which they may not rest.

But there is still a more intimate relation between poetry and theology. It is inevitable that poetry at its noblest should use the theme topics upon which theology has hitherto exercised itself. Love, duty, God, immortality, sin, failure, the great conflicts of life, the great facts of experience, the final goal of all endeavor, the great hopes and great fears of humanity—to these poetry comes back as the needle to the pole star drawn by their depths and reach and wide suggestiveness. It is this which has made poetry theological from the first, it could not be content until it measured itself against the greatest.

In all this the method of poetry has widely varied. Sometimes it has been epic, dealing in continuous and majestic narrations with movement well-nigh cosmic, when gods and men fought together for causes which concerned them both, until

the march of armed hosts echoes through the verse and centuries look down upon the shock of hostile armies contending upon the fields of destiny. And yet through all the epic grandeur one discerns the treatment of theological topics, and presently gods and warriors are only shadows, while the problems of the soul wrought to divine conclusion are the abiding verities. Sometimes poetry is lyric hiding the profundity of its suggestions behind the charm of its song and spanning the deep abysses of things with wings which seem too slight to beat the ether.

Often poetry is dramatic—acting not reasoning—vital not formal—compressing the lessons of a life in the action of an hour, incarnating the competitive qualities of life in representative souls and then setting them free to find their own places in strife and stress and pain. So love passes on to fruition and righteousness to victory and sin to defeat, and men see before them what they have known within them, and the sources and issues of life are tremendous and dramatic and real. Then presently the curtain falls, and we find that after all we have seen only the incarnate experiences and problems of the soul.

II

I confess quite frankly that all this general introduction to this particular paper was written so long ago that the manuscripts from which I copied it had already begun to turn a bit brown, and I think a preacher or a professor of homiletics needs to be quite careful about using anything of his when either the ink or the paper has begun to fade. But for all that I have used it as much for a background as for anything else. It gives a kind of curious dating to what I am trying to do. I do not think that when I first wrote the now browned manuscript the term "new poetry" had so much as been used. Twenty years ago or less any preacher who was writing a paper for his clerical club about preaching and poetry, for that was exactly

what I did, would document his production with quotations from perhaps a dozen more or less standardized poets. The very quotations he used would have been generally familiar, and the whole effort would have been invested with a kind of traditional authority, as though there was a Holy Writ of poetry with the canon to which nothing may be added and from which nothing may be taken.

Within a very short generation all this has been changed. Poetry for the most part no longer comes in fat volumes, though the collection of Alfred Noyes or Masfield achieves respectable bulk. Poetry comes now in thin, little volumes, and I suppose costs the man who buys it about as much or more a word as it ever cost. It is everywhere in general and nowhere in particular. There are some little magazines which make a specialty of it and lead a precarious existence. It is more likely to fill in spaces in all sorts and conditions of publications which are left over after some prose article is ended.

Unless one reads, as I often fancy the unhappy employees of clipping bureaus must read, a little like hounds upon the trail to follow this or that scent across fields of print, a very great deal of it is likely to escape the most observant. There has grown up amongst us, therefore, a fashion of collecting such fugitive verse in anthologies. Twenty years ago there might have been a half dozen general collections of short poetry, though I doubt if there were so many as that. On the other hand, one could hardly look one's neighbors in the face unless one had all the British poets bound, I suppose, in the ugliest bindings which ever shut in a poet's deathless passion.

Today no one has a collection of British poets unless he has inherited them, but I am perilously near a six-foot shelf of more or less important anthologies, and a growing section of this is literally new verse.

It needs no long turning of any of these collections to see that some very revolutionary things have, within the reasonable memory of any probable reader of this article, happened to

poetry. Untermeyer, in his Preface to *Modern British Poetry*, dates the new departure from about 1894. The Victorian Age, he thinks, had already been dead for about ten years, and Untermeyer himself has no tears to shed over the departed. I am more and more inclined to think, possibly because I may be more or less Victorian myself, that Victorianism at its best was far more than plush-covered furniture, wax flowers under glass, lyric sentimentalism and false romanticism. It was also at its best a noble idealism and a high-minded approach to life which our own time has not yet made manifest.

But however that may be, there has been no more vigorous reaction against almost everything Victorianism stood for than in the region of poetry. A good many foreign influences contributed to the reaction. French influence began to tell and also what is known as the Celtic Revival. But if the new poetry had been left to such influences as these, the world would have been a long time noting its coming. When Rudyard Kipling began to sing his "Barrack-room Ballads" and his songs of "The Seven Seas," new poetry came marching in to a gusty music. The Queen herself became the Widow of Windsor, and the improprieties of Kipling's references to the Lady probably kept him from becoming poet laureate. Tennyson had sung the "Idylls of the King," Kipling sang the glories of the Empire.

He took his themes from what he knew best and mostly from India, but at least he found them where they were in the unclouded light of his contemporaneous world. He had a feeling for force and mechanics and marine engines. He maintained that romance could be shipped "on a ram-you, dam-you liner with a brace of bucking screws" as well as on a square-rigged, copper-bottomed, East-Indiaman. He managed to make music out of a doubtful vocabulary and released influences which, though they are not so strong as they were in the first decade of the century, still find a recognizable echo in a good deal of modern verse.

Here I should think is the first characteristic of the new poetry. It pretends, at least, to be realistic and finds its subject-matter everywhere. I open at random the *Anthology of Magazine Verse for 1927* and find such titles as these: "To a Typist," "To a Tailor's Sad Iron," "Behind a Coffee Urn," "My Shadow," "Coyote," "Cats," "Prayer to the Florence Madonna," "Roman Marching Song," and almost anything else you please. I have taken only the more unusual titles, there are plenty of others which are such things as poets have always loved to sing about, having to do with love and beauty and all the pageantry of earth and sky.

But on the whole new poetry stresses the note of realism sometimes so far as to make a kind of idealism of realism, which by a curious road, brings new poetry around to ancient points of departure. For I suppose poetry began by being realistic, though the realisms of the late stone age were very likely more limited in scope than the realisms of the twentieth century.

But new poetry affects a realism of style to match its choice of themes. Poetry had, up to our own time, rather created its own particular vocabulary. It was nice in its choice of singing syllables and adjectives with little taint of the clay; in fact, a special dictionary for poets might have been arranged out of which with some talent for arrangement almost any one might have managed combinations of words to pass accepted tests. The new poetry takes any word which suits its purpose and makes it do. If this were only Thomas Hardy using the old words of our mother tongue and teaching us what timeless music is hid in the homeliest diction, there would be no great protest even from the Victorians.

But when Edward Daniel Kramer, reporting the general effect which Amy Lowell had on a "lowbrow," remarks in the course of perhaps a hundred lines of blank verse,

Somehow I couldn't believe my eyes,
When I lamped Amy,

we might expect a ghostly protest from the slopes of Parnassus. Matthew Arnold has told us that poetry should be simple, sensuous, and passionate. He would, I think, have to devise new tests for a good deal of modern verse, or else deny it to be poetry.

III

And this brings us rather directly to a matter I have been trying to postpone, for it drives straight at the heart of a very great deal of modern verse. Your new poet is still, in spite of all his protests to the contrary, an idealist and a serious-minded craftsman. He is trying to take things as they are, or at least, as he thinks they are, and so combine and express them as to set them forth with that transforming touch which has always been the poet's gift. He wants us to see them and feel them in some artistic, some idealistic relation, as if, somehow, by plucking something out of the gutter you might throw it up in the air and make it shine for a moment.

One outstanding phase of new poetry has been its impatience of the sentence of exile which art has so far pronounced against the things, the words, the deeds not only of the commonplace but the sordid, not only of the sordid but the stained. Kramer is really trying to tell us how a man who uses the argot of the street might somehow catch the perfume of lilacs through Miss Lowell's free verse and see again against a garden wall the purple blossoms which, for a moment, had made his poor boyhood free of a timeless beauty. The real trouble with Kramer's poem, which I use simply for illustration, is that he can not get through on the level upon which he began. He ends by having his lowbrow go on like this:

And when she read of a chap named Keats,
Who went for a walk in Tynemouth Streets,
Weary of mist and of falling rain

* * * * *

Hungry to glimpse the sun and hold
His hands outstretched to its warmth and gold,

he is proving in spite of himself what the new poetry set out to disprove; that when any song rises to a noble level it must clothe itself in noble diction and return again to the realms which poetry has always possessed.

This poetry of twentieth-century realism does, however, in the entire force and body of it achieve what it sets out to do. No single article like this can suggest adequately either the range of new topics or the varieties of new treatment. There is next to nothing in our marvelously complex life which does not pass through its alembic—the soul of the prostitute, the soul of the shopgirl, the dynamo, a pullman car, a modern hotel, Chicago, Broadway, Western plain, Southern mountain, Virginia, Iowa, a weed-grown burying-ground, Negroes in a city slum, the homely tasks of the farm, the magic of the Mississippi, cowboys on the range, the medicine dance of the Indian, the soldier come back from war, the loneliness of a homeless woman.

Nor do the stars go unnoticed, nor trees, nor autumn flowers threatened with frost, nor the nostalgias of the soul, nor the tireless quest of the spirit. Many of these poems taken by themselves are inconsequential and enough of them are commonplace; but if you take the whole of them, they are as brave an attempt as was ever made to take a world whose sheer mechanicism seems an utter denial of the free movement of the spirit, and subdue it to the spirit's interpretative power. Just here, I think, there is an unexpected renewal of the ancient kinship between the preacher and the poet. For I suspect the preacher, too, has to deal not only with the whole of life but with the whole of life as it gets itself lived in the setting of our own time.

Modern poetry has come back to the modern world not altogether to compel poetry to come down out of the air and live where men and things are, but to take men and things just as they are and lift them to the levels which are the native home of all song. It is sometimes a pathetic search for beauty where

beauty seems altogether wanting, or a brave quest for music where by the older tests of music there was no harmony at all. I have felt something of this same quest in modern music. One begins to hear the honk of the automobile horn through the symphony or else the hoarse music of industrial cities somehow expressed. The jazz-makers have found strange new instruments, as though music were not alone a thing to be played upon accredited strings and breathed through classic "woods," but something which might be got from anything which makes a noise.

The result has certainly been arresting, and much of it we may devoutly hope is transient; but the whole matter goes beyond the technique. It is really an attempt to secure a new realm for music even if music is transformed by the conquest. Pennell's etchings are quite as much to the point—perhaps more—for he has set out to show us that there is beauty in a skyscraper as well as a cathedral, or that the smoky cañon of State Street has a beauty of its own, or that even the Chicago River is worth etching. It may, after all, be the business of religion to try to do for these things in its own way, what poetry and art and music are trying to do for them, to touch, that is, the entirety of life with its own interpretative insights, or, if that statement is not quite to the point, not to be afraid to approach life at any of its myriad accessible points in the hope of finding something there which catches and holds in its own way some aspect of the eternal values.

There are few things nowadays which a preacher needs or wants to say about the world in which he lives for which he will not find support, illustration, and illumination in the range of contemporaneous poetry. Whether he preaches out of it or not, I think he would better live in it long enough to get acquainted with it. If he finds nothing else there, he will find a revelation of the many-sided play of alert and sensitive minds which will, at least, give him a better understanding of the mind of his time in its strange two-sidedness. For this

new poetry on one side shows the wide contact of the mind of our time with every phase of life—its curiosity, its caprice, its fearlessness, its love of the clay and its love of the star. It will show him on the other side the winged mind of our time refusing to remain entangled in what it has seized upon but striving by sheer force of insight and a passion after truth and beauty, either to lift all these things into another region or passing through them to find beyond some aspect of timeless beauty.

There is after all a very deep feeling for life through all this singing and now and then a splendor of insight to match any poet of them all. So much of it, like a little poem called "The Victory" by John Hall Wheelock, is after all the poet's passion to escape from the entanglements of time and sense by the only flight which is possible to him—the flight of a song:

I shall take flight from death on sudden wings,
In some swift song; he shall not have me here—
For all his cunning, all his snares and slings,
I shall escape him, whom I fear.

Then, though he wander through all woods and ways,
He will not reach to *me* out of the strong
Net of these tangled nights and days
Escaped forever in a song.

IV

There is no end of what one may keep on saying here but I should think the preacher had something also to learn from the new forms which poetry is trying to create for itself. I think I discern some considerable recession of the tide of free verse; the older forms are beginning to reassert themselves. But for all that, there is really an enormous variety of rhythmic experiment. The new poet is trying to break up the conventional, to make the phrase rather than the word the unit of rhyme, to get away from lilting syllables, to get grit into his composition and still keep a ripple in it. The new poet knows that words are

saved by their association, that no word is commonplace if used in a right way for a high purpose; that there is a poetic force in the words of the street and the factory.

We, who are under a strong tradition of craftsmanship and who use hallmarked words, might well take a lesson from these poets. They might teach us ways of taking the stiffness out of our styles, conventionality out of our phrases, and getting a freshness into our work which would do it no harm. They might also teach us how our contemporaries, who are really trying to do serious work, are approaching the great controlling themes both of poetry and preaching. Marguerite Wilkinson in her very suggestive book *New Voices* makes such a study easy. She groups representative poems under half a dozen suggestive chapter headings: "Love in Contemporary Poetry," "Nature," "Democracy," "Patriotism," "Personality," and "Religion." The poems she quotes supply a salutary correction of our too vague generalities.

"Democracy," for example, as the poets break it into many-banded light, is no longer an abstract thing; it is A Miner in the Dark, Girls in a Flower Factory, The Time-clock, The Immigrant at Ellis Island. Or else it is Carl Sanburg's "Chicago" or "The Prima Donna of a Negro Jazz Orchestra." There is a strong feeling for nature in modern verse, and I know no better way to be assured of that than to keep Mrs. Richards' Anthology "The Melody of Earth and Sky" where one can easily lay one's hands on it.

One will find oneself praying with Edward Markham:

Teach me, Father, how to go	But my spirit, propt with power,
Softly as the grasses grow;	Make as simple as a flower.
Hush my soul to meet the shock	Let the dry heart fill its cup,
Of the wild world as a rock;	Like a poppy looking up.

To end with, there are in contemporary poetry outstanding religious elements of unexpected veracity, beauty, and significance. This particular approach to religion is as free and unconventional as any other phase of new poetry, but the feeling

is there and in a strong way the faith. It would seem that now, as always, when longing and insight find their wings they come home to God as a homing pigeon. Their flight is not always direct, but the arrival is destined. As these singers grapple with all the shadowed side of life, its travails and its sacrifices, one begins to see slowly immergent the stark strength of the cross or the tender certainty of the Incarnation.

The war drove poetry back upon the meaning and cost of redemption and it has not since escaped that drive. There has been for twenty years now a growing feeling for Jesus of Nazareth, and it would be possible to reconstruct almost the entire Gospel narrative out of modern poetry, all of it reverent, some of it illuminatingly beautiful. A poem like Harry Kemp's "I Cannot Put the Presents By" is a modern rendering of "Behold I Stand at the Door and Knock." Eunice Tietjens' "The Man Who Loved Mary" could stand without fear by the side of Browning's "Strange Experience of Karshish." John Oxenham's "Where Are You Going, Greatheart?" is one of the splendid marching songs of Christian purpose. And I should think Violet Alleyns Storey's "Wood of the Cross" one of the loveliest poems about the cross ever written.

If one stands far enough away from the music of contemporaneous song to lose its more strident notes and catch only its vaster and more constant harmonies, it is a music worth attending to. More than that, I believe it will prove itself not to have lost those intimate relations to the preacher's task which poetry has hitherto revealed. It is still interpretation, it still deals with the many-sided experiences of life, it is still rich in insight, it is still in the noblest forms of it informed with the mother stuff of religion and, leaving out Tennyson and Browning, it approaches religion itself more freely and from more sides than the generality of English-speaking verse up to our own time. An old alliance rich in long association is not yet dissolved.

PRESENT-DAY TRENDS IN AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM

EVERETT CARLETON HERRICK

President of the Newton Theological Institution, Newton Center, Mass.

THERE are many times when we have the sense of being surrounded by mighty forces, which seem to lay strong and invisible hands upon us and predetermine the way that we must take. These forces are social in their consequences as truly as individual,

For mankind are one in spirit
And an instinct bears along.

Again there are times when these forces seem more like the winds of heaven that blow whithersoever they list. We cannot create them; we cannot control them; but we can set our sails and make our course according to the way they blow.

One is Freedom; one is Fate; and between the two is a baffling No-Man's Land from which these forces proceed. It is an ancient ground for our speculation where Philosophy, in the phrase of Henry Adams, can offer only its "unintelligible answers to insoluble questions." There are times when we feel so helpless in the grasp of these forces, that we are tempted to fly to the arms of an Absolute Will. Sometimes, in real or fancied triumph over Nature and her stern conditions we say, like some cheerful biological optimist, "At last man may direct his own evolution."

We are living, as we have so often been told, in an age of speed. And this modern speed is not only physical but psychological. Ideas, when they exist, are as mobile as the population in which they circulate. We have witnessed old and static civilizations thrown into revolution—Republics and Communisms emerging out of the convulsions.

Doubtless no generation ever saw as many social and

political upheavals as ours. Systems of thought can spring up and spread over half the earth, almost in a day and a night. Movements that in other days would have operated slowly, now move almost with the mysterious rapidity of an electric current.

So we find ourselves asking, as are many others, What is the effect of these potent trends upon our religious institutions? What are they doing to our American Protestantism? Are these forces of the kind that are binding us and carrying us whither we would not, or are they such as we may utilize in shaping a future and a better Protestantism?

Are these influences disrupting the old familiar landmarks and effecting the dissolution of our churches in spite of all our effort to survive? Or are they like the wind currents, that blow as they may, while, by the set of our sails, and the turn of the helm, we can still hold for a far destined haven?

In the November, 1928, *Atlantic* the article by Herbert Parrish has a surprising reference to the time element in the Protestant upheaval caused by these disruptive forces: "The break-up of the old theological systems and the old organizations of Protestantism, confidently forecast two years ago, has now reached a condition so advanced that men are already beginning to plan the salvage of spiritual values."

The interesting phrase here is this "confidently forecast two years ago." While, through an apparent lapse into modesty, the forecaster is not named he can be inferred. If, however, as he says, so much of a break-up can occur with clear prediction in two years, we are, in the non-classic, but wholly expressive language of our day, "going some!"

And there is not one, but many voices and facile pens predicting the speedy decay of Protestantism. They point to its futile search for a binding authority and the dissipation of its strength through endless divisions. They declare that at last Protestantism has reached its final dilemma: on the one hand a Fundamentalism, that in its effort to make religion authori-

tative has made it ridiculous; and on the other hand a Modernism, that in its effort to make religion respectable has reduced it to a kind of pernicious anemia—"The nadir of nothingness."

If, however, we may learn from the lessons of the past (which we seldom do), we can still fall back with some degree of confidence on the lines of the old hymn, semi-inspired if not more,

God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform.

The forces that move upon us and about us seldom bring us either to the dire ends or the glorious hopes which we are forever evolving from our vain imaginings. In plainer words, things are seldom as bad as they are painted or as good as they are promised. Where the trends of our day may bring us, the humble observer will do well not to prophesy. He may only seek to point out the direction in which they seem to be carrying us.

I

One of the time-honored features of our Protestantism that is being strongly affected by the spirit of our day is the sermon. It is becoming more and more difficult, as all must recognize, for the sermon to go on its own momentum. This is evidenced by the feverish effort which the sermon-makers or more truly perhaps, the sermon-deliverers—the terms are by no means synonymous—so often make to keep the sermon's place in the sun, or in the ecclesiastical spotlight. There is a changing attitude that makes it necessary for the sermon to find special conveyance in order to "get itself over," as we are accustomed to say.

In our non-liturgical churches the sermon was for long the main feature of the meeting or the worship. The pulpit stood in the center; it was the focal as well as the vocal point in the sanctuary. All the rest of the service was more or less accessory, preliminary, and benedictory to the sermon,

Gamaliel Bradford, in his fascinating book, *Life and I*, remarks that if there is anything that finally kills the Protestant Church it will be the sermon. One need not agree with this to appreciate the remark. For after all, the sermon is a miracle of survival. It has shown itself to be indestructible, fire-proof, and fool-proof. In spite of all its rivals coming continually into the field, newspapers, automobiles, sports, golf, both as a sport and an occupation, in spite of the radio, and in spite of its everlasting dullness, preaching notwithstanding still survives.

But preaching is engaged in a very serious quest of some new and favorable setting. Some quests are frantic and bizarre; some are sober and serious; but all come from an urge that seems almost a necessity. And the movement in general is very strongly in the direction of the sermon in the setting of worship. As American Protestantism is becoming somewhat mature and well circumstanced, it is being influenced by a sort of Gothicism.

As one goes about and sees new and sometimes even remodeled churches, he is struck by the fact that the pulpit is being gently and slowly pushed to one side. The chancel is coming back; "creeping back" one might better say.

Sometimes it impresses one as a rather empty and makeshift change. There is no altar, or suggested altar, that becomes the center for the ardent eye or heart. But the change does show quite significantly the direction in which we are moving.

The new Chapel at Princeton, for example, is one of the most impressive Gothic structures in America. It seems like a noble English church brought in stately splendor across the Atlantic. The little tree of Calvinism planted at Princeton has produced golden apples, and this is the consequence.

Then again, only yesterday the vested choir and a church processional were rarely seen outside an Episcopal church. Today one finds them almost everywhere; and strange and varied oftentimes is the manner of their entrances and exits.

Strange too are the surpliced effects. Frequently the minister walks amid the flowing robes of the choir as lonely and unadorned as the unhappy guest in the parable who appeared without his wedding garment.

But assuredly we are not moving back to the Victorian Prince Albert, but on, somehow or somewhere, toward the goal of a properly sterilized ritualism.

All of this means that the sermon is coming more and more to be a part in an order of worship. This is something that the preacher may do well to study. Rightly appreciated and used, "it is all to the good."

Publicity, snappy topics, pulpit graphics, concert music, mechanical embellishments, are temporary expedients. Worship is not temporary; it is a path that leads forth from a dim and immeasurable past into a dim and incalculable future. But everywhere there shines upon it the radiance of man's undying hope and aspiration.

The preacher who can satisfy the worship-hunger of a considerable group and thereby make worship the ally and the perspective of his sermon has something far better than a display "ad" in the Saturday paper.

Here then is one trend to be noted. To a rapidly increasing degree our Protestantism is searching for satisfactions in worship. It is building its quest into its temples, and is seeking to beautify the avenues by which we approach the Infinite. Such a moving spirit does not forecast a speedy end.

II

It is to be observed that there is in our churches a growing dependence on what, for lack of better designation, we may call leadership—personality.

Churches, like the sermon, used to go on their own momentum far more than they do today. Their program was comparatively simple. Their rivals were comparatively few.

People went more or less from the sheer force of custom, and frequently because there was nowhere else to go and little else to do.

Today it is far different. Churches must be *made* to go. They must issue their appeal in the midst of a hundred attractions and distractions that bid for popular support.

In consequence churches must have alert and vigorous leadership if they are to maintain themselves in the midst of a generation which, if no more crooked and perverse than others, is certainly far more indifferent and diverse.

Unhappily much of the leadership we are getting is not the kind of leadership that we need most. It is promotion leadership when we need prophetic leadership. It is organization leadership when we need spiritual leadership. The ability to make a church program and put it across is not sufficient for meeting the deep religious needs of any generation. Our generation needs interpretation far more than organization.

Yet how often it happens that churches are conceived as reaching a high point of success when they can be described as well organized. This is undoubtedly an achievement in leadership. But the leader has too often degenerated into a sort of chief mechanic. His time, his ingenuity, his art, such as it is, and even his genius have been consecrated to the oiling of his church machinery rather than to the holier unction that goes with prophetic insight. This plainly is not the kind of leadership that can challenge the souls of men and glorify the cross by which the conquests of love are forever made.

Yet we are at the place where churches wait and even languish for the coming of their leader. They were never more lost without him and never more ready to respond when he comes.

Bright is the ring of words
When the right man rings them.
Fair the fall of songs
When the singer sings them.

Along with the deadening effect of super-organization is the equally deadening influence of never-ending conferences and commissions, questionnaires and investigations.

We are forever stating our problems and making surveys. It will be a better day when we can cease, in some measure at least, from using figures to conceal facts and get back to what the Prophet said or might have said, "Not by machinery nor by statistics, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord."

If we can produce this spiritual leadership, we will go on as we always have leaving our problems largely behind us. We never seem to learn that few problems are ever solved. Rather, they are dissolved. They disappear in the glow and power of some great personality. He changes the very atmosphere. He turns on a new light. He leads to a new endeavor and a higher vision. New problems for old, new conquests, but on under the spell of leadership toward the shining Table Lands that forever gleam before us. Contrary, therefore, to what has just been said it must be admitted that our Protestantism does have one problem. It is this: Can we produce the leadership that we need? If we can, all the resources of a great inheritance and a Canaan of new and thrilling conquests awaits us.

III

Another most significant trend of our day is toward a new two-party emphasis in our churches.

We are a two-party country. This is one of the peculiarities of the American political development. In this regard we are quite different from the European peoples. They are of several parties; or as Italy and Russia, one; each being apparently worse than the other. With us the third party has never really arrived. If Theodore Roosevelt could not do it, it is safe to assume that it can not be done.

This sweeps through our entire social order. There are frequently many sides to our questions, but usually only two ways to vote. The wets are not all wet, and the drys are not

all dry; yet one has to be one or the other. He may be a sort of Laodicean on the matter; neither hot nor cold. But there is no provision for that attitude on a referendum.

So one may insist that he is neither Fundamentalist nor Modernist. Doubtless he is correct, but that insistence does not help him when the issue is called. If he does not play, he must at least shout for one or the other. Thus today it is becoming quite apparent that there is an increasing two-party alignment in our churches between those who may be described as the denominationally-minded and the non-denominationally-minded people.

"The Talk" and "the Conferences" are largely about unity, and at best they seem as futile as immemorial talk has always been.

But meanwhile the movements toward various kinds of cooperation go steadily on. In all of our churches we need a new apologia for loyalty. The old sectarian loyalties are losing their hold. The missionary cause, for instance, that yesterday was an appeal to a denominational task, is rapidly becoming a tremendous and engaging appeal to an interdenominational task.

Yet, in spite of all that may be said, our denominations are the historic colonies in our rather loose but growing confederation of American Protestantism. In the scheme of things, as they have come to be, denominations are in the nature of necessary evils. But gradually the idea is dawning upon vast numbers that our churches are not unrelated institutions independent of one another but are agencies for the promotion of a common cause. And this closer cooperation is not coming through theological agreement so much as through economic necessity. Convictions, however, are quite as likely to be the result of some action as the cause of it. And innumerable Protestants are coming to have strong convictions on the matter of church cooperation for the simple reason that they have been cooperating. For it is quite human for any of us to

become the stanch defenders of a cause, once we have been even unwittingly drawn into it.

There is a new attitude appearing in regard to the various kinds of church federation and comity that have developed in recent years. At first they seemed like makeshift arrangements, temporary expedients. They are more than such. In the plan of church federation there is a preservation of denominational values and traditions, and with this preservation a practical method of operation in the face of new necessities. More than we can easily realize there has developed a great host of Protestants whose denominational loyalty, so far as they have any, is largely centered in a local church. When they move, as all real Americans do from time to time, to some other community, they are likely, without the least hesitation at all, to transfer their loyalty to a church of another denomination.

Matrimony often effects the same results. And sometimes when people move into a different neighborhood, the companionships the children make determine the church the parents select; giving us thereby a new application of the old text concerning the little child that leads them.

Our Protestantism must reckon with this spirit in the immediate future. It is as inevitable as the radio. For the perpetuation of the old divisions on the old grounds it is an enormous obstacle. For the promotion of a better Protestant cooperation it is an equally immense advantage.

IV

Such as these by no means constitute all of the movements that are affecting our American Protestantism today.

The wide and more or less wild activity in the field of religious education must inevitably influence our churches. If it is a mistake to take all its vast output of labor and literature for the church school too seriously, it is equally a mistake to ignore it. The whole scheme of the time-honored Sunday

school has altered in less than a generation. We are departmentalized for good or ill; and the innocent child of the church passes through a graded process in which the relics of the good old days are mingled with the last vagaries of some psychological amateur. Yet something must come of it all, and assuredly something good. Time winnows our grain, and the benefits of all that is being worked out today will fall more richly, let us hope, on the next generation.

V

Another movement which does not appear so much in outward results, but which is exceedingly potent within, is the theological effort to turn the streams of humanism into the vineyards of the Lord. If we may consider the humanism that is pervading so much of modern thought, in part at least, as an awakened sensibility of human worth, and not simply as a rather vague dogma of non-personality in the conception of the divine; we may be grateful to those, who, like Bishop McConnell, are capturing its truly religious values for the fortification of our faith.

While we may not be disposed to admit that these are disrupting forces, they are most assuredly altering forces. They are changing the conditions in which our churches must live and affecting tremendously their future.

Thus when we think of these stirring movements within, as well as the sinister movements against us, we realize, and we need to realize, that these days are days of crises. And if inflexibility is essential to an enduring Protestantism, our case certainly was never so bad as now, and we might as well surrender to the *semper-idem* of Rome.

But if Protestantism is the religion of democracy and still more of adaptation, as we hold it to be, then we should see in these trends forces that may be utilized in our never-ending task of building out of the church that is the church that is evermore to be. It is a true opportunity for the enriching of

worship when we may, without disruption, bring from our treasures things both new and old. The feeling of incongruity is soon over, for time after all is a rapid blender.

It is a thrilling call to leadership when a new spirit is drawing together many of the scattered groups that constitute the multitudinous folds of the Protestant flock. And out beyond these are the other sheep who frequently cannot find their place in the older order, but who are ready, we may trust, to respond to some new call.

"I suspect," says Rufus Jones, "that the largest single denomination in the world today is the Church of the Seekers." Perhaps the suspicion is too hopeful. Too many whom we would think of as Seekers may be only revolters; yet it is in such that Protestantism must find its hopes, and out of its hopes its nobler realizations. In any case the Seekers are within as well as without.

And our Protestantism has always been enriched by these seekers and finders, even though sometimes they have gone into strange paths. And there is a very ancient promise of rich reward to those who truly seek the everlasting God.

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION: DELUSION, ILLUSION, OR HALLUCINATION?

Professor WILLIAM J. THOMPSON

Drew Theological Seminary

Were the witnesses of Christ's resurrection under a delusion, an illusion, or an hallucination?

DELUSION

DELUSION occurs in minds saturated with one idea. That idea subsidizes the eye and ear, and interprets the outside world in accord with its dictates. A sick child with the dominant idea that all medicines are distasteful, avows the pill swallowed bitter, though it sued for entrance sugar-coated. The skulking fugitive criminal interprets rustling leaves as footfalls of pursuing detectives. The superstitious vagrant in a countryside cemetery at midnight declares his muscular twinge the uncanny grasp of a ghost. Those near and dear to us we often dower with excellencies we cherish for them, but which they possess not.

Vivid must be the vision, loud the noise, pungent the odor, violent the seizure, captivating the argument that annuls a dominating idea, installs its opposite, and thus dispels a delusion.

Before His death "Jesus began to show unto his disciples how he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day." "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

The imperviousness of Mary Magdalene to these statements was due to her being under the dominating idea of Jesus, as a political Redeemer. In this deputed rôle he succumbed—a failure. She held with Martha, "He shall rise again in the

resurrection at the last day." Accordingly she went on the morning of the third day to the tomb believing that he was dead. This, her belief, is substantiated by her carrying spices for his enbalmmment. Beholding the tomb empty, she did not inquire, "Where has he gone?" but "Where have they laid him?" So strong was the dominating idea of his resurrection not taking place until the last day that though she took the journey early in the morning when folk-lore declares the spirits of the departed "come floating through the night and fade away in the morning light," yet this woman from whom seven devils had been cast—a sign of nervous instability—saw no one whom she thought the risen Christ. The figure whom she beheld standing, to whom she spoke, and who replied, "Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou?" was the risen Christ himself. Not until the colloquy had proceeded was her belief that he had not risen dislodged. Evidence extraordinary was necessary to evoke her exclamation, "Rabboni." Mary's mind was emphatically unreceptive to a resurrection-delusion. So strongly was the non-resurrection idea entrenched that her conversion to "He is risen" indicates that the most formidable evidence must have been presented.

Notwithstanding the fact that the woman told the two who met Jesus on the way to Emmaus that they had seen the risen Lord, yet so dominant was the idea of a regal Messiah in the minds of these two men that though they walked seven and a half geographical miles over a frequented Roman paved road, through a populous region, they met no one they acclaimed as the risen Lord. One stranger who joined them admonished them for their slowness of belief and expounded the Jewish prophecies from Moses, the Psalmist, and from the prophets, to the end that the Messiah must needs suffer, die, and rise again. Their hearts burned. They did not at first believe him the risen Lord. They were at the antipodes of such a belief. Their conversion therefrom to the belief that he was the risen Lord showed them under no resurrection-delusion

and that the strongest possible evidence must have been presented.

All the apostles were present except Thomas. It was night. Notwithstanding the women's report that they had seen the risen Lord, and the further corroboration by the two disciples, yet the others present did not believe. They most certainly would have believed at once had they been under a resurrection-delusion.

Suddenly a visitor appeared with this friendly salutation, "Peace be unto you." The group if under a delusion, instantly would have exclaimed in a chorus, "Christ our risen Lord is here." This they did not. Rather did they suspect an apparition. "I am no spirit," said he. "Handle me and see." Nor did this evoke "Behold the Lord is risen indeed." He asks for something to eat. They gave him broiled fish, and he did eat it. With the political and dead Christ dominant overwhelming was the evidence that convinced them of his resurrection.

Thomas avowed, "I will not believe that Jesus is risen from the dead though mine eyes see him and mine ears hear him, and mine hands touch him, except it touch the wound-prints." Had Thomas known the tell-tale of finger-prints he would have exacted them. "Whoever is anxious that a discussion should go to the bottom of a subject, must rejoice to see the opposite side well represented," said John Stuart Mill. Thomas fulfils this. No one could have been farther from a delusion than he. Most convincing must have been the evidence to exhort from this arch-doubter the exclamation: "My Lord and my God!" That none of the witnesses was under a delusion can be affirmed without the shadow of a doubt.

ILLUSION

An illusion is the condition of mind where a sense is stimulated by an object "A" but the credit goes to "B." Hold in your hand a weight of large dimensions, next the same weight in small dimensions. The latter will be estimated the lighter.

While sitting in the railroad station a parallel train moves. You believe yours to be moving, but it is stationary. Railroad tracks are seen in the distance to meet. In a glass of water a stick appears to be broken—its withdrawal dispels the illusion. Reason aided by two or more senses guards us from illusions.

Mary recognized Jesus by his voice. (It might have been a voice similar to his.) She hied away and spread the news of his resurrection. Her report was based on one sense only; consequently, on a possible illusion. She also saw him, possibly touched him, at least believed him touchable, but was forbidden by "Touch me not." That she was under an illusion is dissolved by her two other senses concurring, those of sight and touch. What she saw, heard, and could have touched, was produced by vital motion. Furthermore, to her multiple sense experience reason contributed. His words, "I am not yet ascended," and "My Father and your father," are indices that the risen Christ was speaking. He manifested himself to Mary vocally, visually, palpably, and mentally; in all the ways he could. After such a manifestation her only sane conclusion could have been, He has arisen. To declare her under an illusion is preposterous.

He conversed with the two with whom he sat at meat. His visual, audible, tactile manifestations were supplemented by his exposition of the Scriptures, and this made illusion impossible. With such evidence, and then not to believe Christ arisen would be proof irrefragable of abnormality.

In his appearance to the apostles, he appealed to touch, sight, hearing, taste, smell, and added this remarkable declaration "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." "And these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

The risen Christ manifested himself in all the ways possible, somatic and psychic, leaving no grounds for even the penumbra of a shadow of an illusion.

HALLUCINATIONS

Hallucinations transpire when mental changes occur independently of external phenomena which they casually subsume. One suddenly sees a star; it is not in the sky. An occipital blow on the skull has produced it. Reputable psychological statistics rate one person in ten as having had an hallucination. Hallucinations are induced by alcohol, opium, nitrous oxide gas, and a number of other drugs. Miners who were entombed for several weeks reported themselves as having visited in the meantime their homes. Many diseases cause hallucinations. Burning with a fever of 105 degrees, the patient would have naught else. The Greeks called epilepsy the religious disease because it irrupted hallucinations. Martin Luther at Wartburg saw the devil puffing, and then threw his ink bottle at him. Loyola saw the Virgin Mary. Swedenborg had his hand pressed by an angel. In the early church visions played a larger part than some historians are willing to concede. Tertullian declared, "The majority of men learn God from visions." An hallucination prompted Joan of Arc to lead a despairing nation to victory and thus effect for France a service akin to Washington's for America. During twenty-three years of Mohammed's prophetic life, he often went into comas. Perhaps he was an epileptic. He had visions—hallucinations—many. After fifteen hundred years, his devotees approximate 234,000,000. Hallucination is the acorn of a Mohammedan tree of massive magnitude. What a momentous part hallucinations might have in Christianity!

Mary recognized Christ by his voice. Of 1,890 collected hallucinations 629 were auditory. Thinking at times becomes "audible," and eventuates in allocating its origin to a voice exterior to the thinker. May it not have been Christ's frequent

salutation, "Mary," ringing in her ears while she was in the garden, that she externalized and ascribed to Christ as being near by and calling her by name?

Assyrians, Greeks, Romans, Chinese, and Egyptians practised "crystal gazing." For such a purpose was the "cup of divination" found in Benjamin's sack. Gaze steadfastly upon a bright object; thereupon, the subconscious irrupts past memories which consciousness declares "here and now" objective realities. The intensity of Constantine's gazing on a cross was projected, synchronously with his uplifted eyes, into the sky and beneath this subjective cross he read, "In this, conquer." Of 1,890 studied hallucinations, 147 were tactile. Three-fourths of those with amputated limbs have reached for scissors to cut quondam toe-nails of long ago.

The traveler whom the two disciples met on their way to Emmaus made a profound impression. A little later, sitting at meat and gazing intently upon a bright object they imaged Christ so vividly that they ascribed to him an objective reality in their midst; accordingly, they declared him arisen. However, their hearing him, beholding his tangibility, listening to his utterances, with no variation in their experience all conjoined to make any hallucination on this occasion an impossibility, and his objective presence a reality.

The witnesses of the resurrection were familiar with hallucinations. Peter knew his vision on the housetop of a great sheet filled with "all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air," had no objective reality. Paul, of Troas, knew the man of Macedonia void of spacial relations. These forewarned witnesses would have been lynx-eyed for hallucinations.

There are numerous instances of dual hallucinations in the same person, particularly in hearing and seeing. Nor is there lacking the addition of touch, thus making all three in the same individual. Might not the witnesses of Christ's resurrection have had these multiple hallucinations? The witnesses,

individually and collectively, heard and saw identically with no variants in their sensory experiences. They were also a unit in the core of the meanings they gave to the risen Lord's utterances. Shall we declare them under an hallucination?

The algebraic formulas for permutations and combinations are:

$${}_n P_r = \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3) \dots (n-p)}{1, 2, 3, 4, \dots (n-p)}$$

$${}_n C_p = \frac{n(n-1)(n-2) \dots (n-r+1)}{1, 2, 3, \dots r, (r)}$$

Applied in the eleven appearances of our risen Lord to the number of witnesses, the multifarious stimuli of their senses would asseverate that the resurrection data in the New Testament of Christ's resurrection resting upon an hallucination has only one chance in staggering millions.

Jesus chose his disciples. They differed in temperament. Accordingly, had they been under hallucinations they could not have seen and heard the risen Lord, simultaneously and concurrently. Unison, which characterized all their sensory testimony, absolves them from hallucinations. Psychology and mathematics are one in establishing the resurrection in reality.

Hallucinations of those whose hope had been mangled, as had theirs, could not have the exhilaration of enthusiasm to sweep in one day three thousand into belief in the risen Lord. On the contrary, their hallucinations, of "blackest midnight born," would have paralyzed their will to make converts and prefixed to the three thousand the sign minus.

Fifty days after the resurrection, the day of Pentecost, the disciples to the amazement of assembled peoples were speaking in foreign tongues, beholding flames of fire, hearing a rushing wind, disporting themselves in the eyes of onlookers as drunkards. Had they been habitués of hallucinations they would have had them abundantly on this hilarious occasion. "I see

Him," "I hear Him," "I touch Him," would have staccatoed the air. Not one declared he saw, heard, or touched him. Had there been hallucinations on preceding days they would not have ceased on this day. Hallucination did not father any phase of their testimony of the risen Lord—objective reality alone did.

A study of the Scriptural statements of the resurrection of Jesus yields no evidence of any delusion, illusion, or hallucination.

The chemistry and physiology of the body of our risen Lord I do not deem within the scope of this article more than to remark that even if the resurrection body had not been of the same eleven or more chemical elements, nor of the same physiological functioning as his pre-deceased body, it could have stimulated the nerve endings of the eyes and ears of spectators and hearers in his eleven appearances as effectually as was done by Him during His public ministry. Without these sensory phenomena Easter to me would be fatuous.

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead."

NEO-UNIVERSALISM

Dean LEE S. McCOLLESTER, D. D.

Crane Theological School, Tufts College

LIKE all systems of thought, Universalism has passed through changes. Always there have been advocates of some form of universal salvation. Sometimes it has been a minor doctrine of great sects; its advocates merely expressing their personal ideas as to the final condition of mankind, while other doctrines have so absorbed the interest of the majority that the few and their arguments have been ignored by the sect or institution.

Likewise there have been many phases of what has been called Universalism. Some advocates of the doctrine have argued that man gets all his punishment in this world: some have argued that the sacrifice of Christ was adequate to pay the penalty for the sins of all so that at death all men would enter a state of bliss: some have argued a purgatorial period after death in which all would finally be cleansed of their sins.

Universalism of the eighteenth century was an active movement in Middle Europe and England. It is interesting to note the number of books published in England in the century between 1750 and 1850 in defense of, or in attacks upon, the doctrine which said that in some way all souls would be saved. What is known as American Universalism came directly from England. Its entrance into the colonies was romantic. In London was a preacher named Relly who was emphasizing the doctrine that ultimately all souls would be saved. A young Methodist was sent to refute him but instead was himself converted to Relly's teachings. The young Methodist and his wife became enthusiastic for the doctrine, and John Murray became an advocate of universal salvation in London. Soon after this conversion of Murray to Universalism, his wife suddenly died, and in his grief he sailed away to America telling his friends that he was going to bury himself in the new land.

He evidently thought he could flee from his grief. As the ship on which he sailed was approaching New York, it was driven over the bar at Barnegat Bay on the Jersey Coast, and it became necessary to put part of the cargo in a small sloop in order to get back across the bar into the main channel. Murray was left in charge of the cargo transferred to the small boat and for needed supplies of food went on shore. In his search, he came to a man cleaning fish. The man's name was Thomas Potter, uneducated, so far as school, but deeply interested in religion and seeking an interpretation of Christianity that would satisfy his mind. Murray asked to buy his fish for the ship, but Potter replied, "I get these fish from the sea by merely fishing for them, and you may have all you want freely." Then Potter addressed the young man saying, "You are a preacher." John Murray answered, "I shall never preach." But Potter pushed his question further and said, "You have preached." Thus cornered, Murray said that he had preached, but that he should never preach again. Potter said, "You have a gospel to preach, and do you mean to say that you will not give your message of life to men?" and added: "I have built a church which you see yonder. I welcome to it any one who has a message, but as yet I have not heard what seems to me the real message of Christ to humanity. When your ship came over the shallows, something told me that in that boat was the man I have been seeking. I have the belief you have the message I am after, and you will preach in yonder church on Sunday." Much taken aback, Murray replied, "I must go on to New York with this ship as soon as the wind changes." Potter replied, "The wind is against you and will not change until after Sunday, when you have preached." The wind continued unfavorable and much against his will, John Murray did preach, and his sermon was an earnest utterance of his own conception of God, Christ, and man's destiny. After the service, Potter said, "I have heard the message for which I have been waiting these many years, and you are going to preach

this gospel from now on wherever you may have a chance." Exactly this is what Murray did from that time on. He felt a Providence had directed him, and he found so many calls for his service that he made pilgrimages again and again from Philadelphia to Gloucester, Mass., finally making his home in Gloucester. He arrived in America in the year 1770. John Murray was conservatively evangelical on all points of doctrine, save that he affirmed that the sacrifice of Jesus had been adequate and was meant for the salvation of all mankind, and that all souls would be saved through the sacrifice of Jesus.

Murray's preaching brought other men out from their different denominations, for in most of the sects of that time there were men who held some form of belief in an ultimate salvation of all mankind. These ministers came from the Episcopal, the Methodist, the Baptist, the Congregationalist churches, and from the Hicksite Quakers, uniting on the one doctrine that somehow and some time hereafter all men would be saved. Some of these preachers were trinitarian, and advocated that the sacrifice of Jesus paid the debt of sin for all souls. Some were restorationists, and argued that the death of Jesus restored all men at death to their original state of innocence. Some argued that salvation was by character and through a gradual process of growth in the Christ quality until they should reach perfection. And there were some who argued that salvation is an eternal process, begun on earth by righteous living and to be continued hereafter until all souls shall of their own will obey God.

The first organization of men into a sect was of a general and local character. Its object was sometimes to give one another moral support. In a few cases, it grew out of a local law which required all who were not members of a recognized sect to pay taxes to the town church. It was also an effort to increase the effectiveness of those who emphasized as their foremost doctrine the salvation of all. If up to this time, there had been sharp controversies over the doctrine of the destiny of

men, between believers in universal salvation and believers in endless punishment, there began to be from now on a new controversy amongst Universalists themselves as to what was meant by "universal salvation" and when it was to be accomplished and by what means. There was a very active but not large group known as Restorationists, sometimes called "Death and Glory Universalists," whose extravagant claim was that on death, all men would be restored to their original state of innocence. Opposed to this and gathering strength was a group which advocated salvation by character and by good deeds. These claimed that men on death entered the future state as they left this, and that salvation was a progressive process hereafter dependent upon their deeds in the future as well as their deeds in the past.

In 1803 a group of New England men who had come out from different sects and had been drawn together by their belief in universal salvation, accepted as a working statement the following three articles:

ARTICLE I. We believe that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a revelation of the character of God, and of the duty, interest, and final destination of mankind.

ARTICLE II. We believe that there is one God, whose nature is Love, revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of Grace, who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness.

ARTICLE III. We believe that holiness and true happiness are inseparably connected, and that believers ought to be careful to maintain order and practise good works, for these things are good and profitable unto men.

These articles were not adopted as in any degree a creed, but merely as a general statement by which a group of believers could work together. Through the period from 1803-1850, there was great activity among Universalists. Able preachers arose, and many books, pamphlets, and newspapers were published. But all men and churches stood quite independent of one another, uniting only in local associations and State con-

ventions for the sake of encouraging one another in the belief in the final salvation of all. On the one-hundredth anniversary of the landing of John Murray and the beginning of his ministry in the United States, 1870, a great meeting of Universalists from all parts of the world met in Gloucester, Massachusetts, and a more systematic national government was adopted. Notwithstanding the individual characteristics of Universalists, the "Winchester Profession of Faith" was adopted at this time as the creed of the Church, and ministers henceforth were compelled to assent to its three articles before ordination. No sooner had this been adopted as a basic creed than ministers began to try to change it. Some objected to the statement "will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness" because the word "restore" implied a fall of man and his restoration to original innocence, and most Universalists of the later time repudiated the doctrine of man's fall. Others objected to phrases in the third article as suggesting a utilitarian scheme of salvation in the words, "these things are good and profitable to men." Some objected to having any official creed, as interfering with man's freedom in matters of belief. Year after year at every National Convention, a debate on some phase of these three articles took place. Many amendments and many substitute creeds were offered—only to be voted down. Meanwhile there grew up an increasing disregard for and disuse of the creedal statement and at the National Convention of 1898, an agreement was reached that the Winchester Profession of Faith should no longer stand as a creed, and that in its place should be a statement of general principles, thus:

1. The condition of Fellowship in the Convention shall be as follows:

The acceptance of the essential principles of the Universalist Faith, to wit: The Universal Fatherhood of God; the spiritual authority and leadership of His Son Jesus Christ; the trustworthiness of the Bible as containing a revelation from God; the certainty of just retribution for sin; the final harmony of all souls with God. The Winchester Profession is commended as containing these principles, but neither this, nor any other precise form

of words, is required as a condition of fellowship, provided always that the principles above stated be professed.

Especial emphasis was laid on the "Liberty Clause" that "neither this, nor any other precise form of words, is required as a condition of fellowship, provided always that the principles above stated be professed." Thus the Universalist Church which began first in the occasional utterance by individual preachers in many sects; then in the getting together in local organizations of people upon the one doctrine of "the final salvation of all"; then by a General Convention made of representatives of State Conventions having as a creed the Winchester Profession of Faith, passed back to its original individual freedom and independence of any binding creed. While the forms of statement of belief and purpose and the methods of administering the growing activities and interests of the people have greatly changed, the thought, motives, and objectives of the Church also have been passing through many changes. When the Universalist Church came into being, Protestantism was teaching endless punishment hereafter. Universalism started as a protest against this doctrine, and as the prevailing preaching was about punishment hereafter, so the chief emphasis of Universalism was on a hereafter salvation.

The first contention of the Universalist Church was with Biblical texts. But gradually its leaders—like Hosea Ballou, Thomas Whittemore, and later Alonzo Ames Miner—began to discuss the doctrines of the nature of God and to base their affirmations of the final salvation of all on the nature of God as love, on the belief in man as a welcome child of God and on the law of justice in God's universe. The one-time "death and glory" doctrine died long ago, and the doctrine of eternal progress of the soul began to take form. The destiny of man was to be defended not by proof texts but from the basic doctrine of love as the nature of God. The motive prompting man's search for God was not fear of consequences or hope of reward, but love of God—or a fellowship of man's soul with

God's soul. So, also, the idea of the love of God as the great fact of religion passed from the earlier conception of an "absentee God" to the conception of God as very present spirit moving in all his works, and most of all in the souls of his children. Jesus in these growing thoughts became not a substitute, bearing man's just penalties, but an elder brother teaching humanity how to live near God and grow into the character of Christ, even into a fellowship with God like that which Jesus himself had with God. Salvation became not a miracle but a gradual process. In these changing doctrines, sin and punishment had a definite place. Man reaps as he sows. Sin is a disobedience of God's laws, and all breaking of God's laws brings its consequences, not as vengeance but to teach mankind to love the good, the true, and the beautiful. The laws of God are uncompromising and impartial, and there is no escape for any one from the just consequences of his conduct. It may have been the idea of some, in the early days of controversy, that Universalism was contented with the announcement of the doctrine of final salvation for all. But this is far from being the attitude of Universalists today. The advocates of Universalism have developed a general philosophy of life and of destiny. Particularly do they warn mankind that as one sows, he reaps; that there is punishment here and hereafter until man turns from evil and seeks righteousness; and that Jesus does not take on himself the penalty for man's wrong-doing, but teaches men how to live the true spiritual life that brings men into spiritual harmony with God. The present doctrine of Universalism briefly stated is that man's destiny is eternal progress begun here—for this is God's world—and to be continued for ever. Man, God's child, is endowed with endless capacity to move Godward, and he is offered an infinite universe in which to exercise his God-given powers.

As in many divisions of the Christian church, interest has grown less in man's state after death and more in man's state upon earth, so the great motive of the modern Universalist

Church is not to prove by texts and arguments that all men are to be saved hereafter, but by enlargement of knowledge, elevation of ideals, and more thorough practise of Christian virtues to establish on earth the Christ type of character. In the early years, American Universalism was hostile to all sects that made endless punishment a leading dogma, and it fought valiantly for its chief doctrine that God would save all men, but today the Universalist Church is an especially ardent advocate for the cooperation of all sects in a united effort to establish on earth the practise of the love of God and the universal brotherhood of man. It further feels that all divisions of Christianity have before them the challenge to set aside the doctrines that divide—for these usually are the smaller issues—and come together on the great ideals of love, truth, justice, reverence of God, imitation of the Christ spirit, and practise of brotherhood with mankind. The “New Universalism” is not so much bent on building up its special sect, or backing one doctrine of destiny, as it is in cooperating with men of all races and sects, making this a better world, physically, morally, intellectually, and spiritually; then indeed the destiny we all desire for all humanity will be assured in this world and in the world to come.

THE NEXT STEP IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Professor STEWART G. COLE

A PEOPLE who engage in a great experiment in social democracy will ever turn with perennial interest to the business of the fit education of their youth. The earliest colonists in America began this quest soon after their arrival on the Atlantic seacoast. Subsequent generations have never surrendered the ideal of a socially-trained citizenship, though they have attempted to accomplish this purpose by a variety of civic policies. In as far as the Church and the State have shared jointly in the promotion of popular education, the historian witnesses three rather distinct periods in the growth of this country's school system. There were the extended colonial stages of ecclesiastically-dominated education, the nationalistic emphasis upon independent types of Church and State schools, and recent similar developments in character education in both Church and State. It is the purpose of the writer to indicate the trends in child training during these periods, in order to account in some measure for the problematic school situation which educators have inherited. He can then define some of the more perplexing issues which representatives of Church and State should meet in the interests of youth and democracy.

I. COLONIAL ECCLESIASTICALLY-DOMINATED EDUCATION

The following classical extract, taken from the pamphlet *New England's First Fruits* (printed in London in 1643), signifies the religious stress in education which the early colonists entertained:

After God had carried us safe to New England
and wee had builded our houses
Provided necessaries for our livelihood
Reard convenient places for Gods worship
And settled the civili government

One of the next things we longed for
And looked after was to advance learning
And perpetuate it to posterity
Dreading to leave an illiterate ministry
To the churches when our present ministers
Shall lie in the Dust.

Education soon became much more general than simply the training of Christian ministers. A fit citizenship remained from the beginning the inclusive interest of the people. As traditions took form during the early decades, three distinct types of school policy were conditioned in America.¹ In New England, where a theocracy was instituted, the Church controlled the policy of the State's school. The clergy themselves became the schoolmasters, and universal education was insisted upon. In the middle colonies of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, where such heterogeneous sectarian groupings as Quakers, Scotch Presbyterians, German Reformed, Baptists, and Catholics had settled, a religious state was out of the question as was likewise a common theocratic school system. Each independent sect undertook to educate the youth of its community by means of parochial schools. The State was not permitted to interfere with the management of the school, for it was the property of the Church, and its intent was to preserve the tenets of the sect as well as acquaint the children with the rudiments of learning. A third type of school sprang up in the Southern States, particularly Virginia, where the influence of the Church of England prevailed. The wealthy landowners provided for the tutorship of their youth in private homes or in strictly church schools, while the children of the poor farm tenants remained illiterate or were sent to such charity schools as were sponsored by the Established Church. Only in New England did the State assume direct responsibility for the training of children. In other sections, education rested upon the will of the Church.

¹ E. P. Cubberley, *Public Education in the United States*, pp. 15-25.

However differently colonists conceived the method of management of their local school, they were agreed in making the religious factor a major part of their educational purpose. "Record" after "Record," which the various settlements preserved, relates laws that "the principles of religion" and "the capital laws of this country" constituted the twofold basis for youth training.² In many cases the clergy themselves offered the instruction. Much of the teaching material was taken directly from the Bible or from the catechism of the sect. The earliest school texts were almost exclusively concerned with indoctrinational subject-matter.³ Right culture was conceived in terms of godliness, and good citizenship meant loyalty to the social principles that were enunciated by the religiously-motivated local school.

As immigrant groups expanded the organized colonies, it became increasingly difficult to maintain the early system of superimposed schools. Representatives of various sects took up residence in New England involving the school establishment in conflicts of religious views. Depending upon "the powers that be," sparsely settled sections lacked adequate scholastic facilities. Thus, such experiments as the dame school, the writing school, and the Latin grammar school sprang up with a new emphasis upon non-Biblical subjects of study. Their makers were more concerned with strictly civic responsibility than with the perpetuation of ecclesiastical control.⁴ In the South the pauper class had grown in large numbers, with corresponding increase in illiteracy. This people opposed the select education of the parish school scheme and cried out for independent state-endorsed schools. In the central colonies the parochial school system remained under church supervision until after the founding of the national government. In the

² Several of these records are reproduced in "Why the Principle of Public Responsibility for Education Has Prevailed in the United States," Luther A. Weigle, *Religious Education*, April, 1927, pp. 319-32.

³ Illustrative materials from various texts are given in *A History of the American Sunday School Curriculum*, Frank G. Lankard, pp. 22-32.

⁴ Cubberley, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-28.

Ordinance of 1787 establishing the Northwest Territory, "religion" as well as "morality and knowledge" were still considered "necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind" and, for that reason, were to be inculcated in the schools west of the Ohio River.

Notwithstanding these changes in social attitude and in school policy, which conditions thrust upon the colonies during the first half of the eighteenth century, it may be said that religion remained the ascendant influence in the American training of the young. That religion was Protestant in temper and in conviction, resulting in the development of an ecclesiastically-dominated public education throughout the commonwealths. In the Northern settlements where nonconformist and Puritan ideals prevailed, culture was strongly evangelical in sentiment; in the South culture was qualified by the aristocratic tenure of the Church of England.⁵

To discerning leaders, however, the fine edge of secular-religious differences had entered the school system. A variety of social forces gave impetus to this generally divisive influence.⁶ Especially was this true in New England, where public opinion was destined to have the most telling effect upon future American educational policy. Not only the rise of "district" schools to meet the frontier demands, but the infiltration of Baptists, Methodists, and Unitarians into the well-ordered society of Massachusetts and Connecticut, contributed to the breakdown of the religious establishment. Besides, the commercial interests of the people were weakening the social control of the clergy and the religious motivation of life. Education was encouraged on an increasingly broad curriculum basis. The constant murmurings of the working people in Virginia for a free public-school system that should represent

⁵ Cubberley, surveying colonial education from the point of view of curriculum, concludes that up to 1750, "one learned to read chiefly the catechism and the Bible, and to know the will of the heavenly Father. There was scarcely any other purpose in the maintenance of elementary schools." *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁶ Cubberley, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-46; *The Teaching Work of the Church*, Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, Chap. I; "The Change from the Religious to the Secular Aim in Elementary Education," L. LeRoy Huff, *Religious Education*, March, 1927, pp. 231-36.

the will of the people became a strong reckoning factor in the disintegration of church-controlled schools. The war of the American Revolution gave corporate drive to these diverse interests resulting in very definite religious decline in all phases of American life, not least of which was that in the school policy.

II. NATIONALISM: THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE EDUCATION

The scholastic aims of Church and State so closely entwined in the seventeenth century, loosened somewhat in the first half of the eighteenth century, were officially dissolved by inference in the First Amendment to the National Constitution (1789). This document read, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The Constitution had nothing positive to say about religion, and nothing whatever about education. The former remained for the jurisdiction of the free churches in America, the latter rested presumably with States' rights. (Tenth Amendment to the Constitution.)

If traditions had not been so powerful in community life, this would have allowed very simple and immediate solution of the Church-State educational function. But the passing of a law was not sufficient to reorder the policy of the historic public-school system. The prevailing religious preponderance of interest continued with slight interruption in the older settled areas until well into the nineteenth century. Readjustments were less difficult in Virginia and in New England than in the Middle States, where the sects insisted upon their parochial schools without respect for the rights of religious minorities or for the rising secular consciousness of the people. It would be misleading, therefore, to say that the nationalistic period introduced the separation of Church and State interests in the education of the young. As a matter of fact, this end was accomplished slowly and, in most cases, reluctantly under

the constant pressure of free educators and the increasing electorate upon the church.⁷

To trace the history of change step by step in public-school policy from ecclesiastic domination to secular freedom would prove most rewarding, but that purpose does not lie within the compass of this study. Suffice it to say that the separation was accomplished during the first half of the nineteenth century under the guidance of such men as DeWitt Clinton, Daniel Webster, Horace Mann, and Henry Barnard. They struggled against deeply-rooted religious interests to eliminate sectarianism in the schools and to provide an educational system that guaranteed to the nation a trained and intelligent citizenship.⁸ Providentially, as far as the church was concerned, the Sunday school was imported from England late in the eighteenth century. This institution substituted for the declining parochial school in maintaining a religiously disciplined youth in America.⁹ Though the earliest schools copied the English pattern and stressed the training of poor children in reading and morals, the project became so urgent for sectarian well-being that, as the schools multiplied, they welcomed rich and poor, and specialized in teaching the catechism and the Bible.

By 1850 two complete school systems were firmly established in the United States. The elementary, secondary, and collegiate institutions under the supervision of the State furnished a comprehensive education in secular subjects. The Sunday school and the denominational college under the control of the Church provided instruction in the precepts of the holy Scriptures and in the redemptive principles of Protestantism. The Roman Catholics discharged their particular responsibility through the maintenance of church-financed

⁷ "By 1830 every State had abolished property qualifications for voting, and general manhood suffrage was a concrete reality. These new political beliefs tended to create a new political motive for education, which was destined to grow in importance and in time entirely supersede the old religious motive." (Note also the attitudes of Washington, Jefferson, John Hay, and James Madison toward "the education of the common people.") Cubberley, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-58.

⁸ See Cubberley, *op. cit.*, chaps. 5, 6, 7.

⁹ F. G. Lankard, *op. cit.*, chap. III.

parochial schools in which both secular and religious instruction was given the young. Thus, the colonial ideals of godliness and intelligent citizenship were perpetuated in the nationalistic period, though the method of their propagation was divided between the independent institutional forces of Church and State.

In order to anticipate one important phase of current educational problems, it is well at this point to observe the successive Jewish migrations to America during the latter half of the nineteenth century. In 1850 there were approximately fifty thousand Jews in the United States. Thirty years later the number had increased to a quarter of a million, and by the close of the World War there were over three million, half of whom lived in New York City.¹⁰ The Hebrew faith of this people took its place alongside of Roman Catholicism and the Protestant sects as another operating religion under the protection of the laws of the republic. Indeed, since the Jewish religion was the one universal bond of culture to hold the members of the Diaspora together, its rights and privileges were zealously defended. Jews followed the lead of Christians and instituted Synagogue Sunday schools in which to perpetuate the faith of their fathers in the conduct of the young. While Jewish children shared secular education with their Christian neighbors, their religious education was provided for in strictly sectarian Talmud Torahs.

When the inquirer attempts to appreciate the character of the religious instruction which American children were receiving under the sectarian régime and to compare it with the results of public-school education of the same children, some striking conclusions become apparent. The major stress in all education during the nineteenth century was upon learning a content of curriculum. Examining the tax-supported week-day schools from this point of view, one observes that the youth of this country have been trained in an accumulative

¹⁰ Emanuel Gamoran, *Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education*, II, chap. I.

amount of material bearing on many phases of secular culture.¹¹ More particularly, was increasing attention given to applied sciences and to commercial subjects of study. This tendency was more noticeable as the observer turned from the public to the high school and to the university. This training has resulted somewhat noticeably in the wholesale development of utilitarian commercial attitudes toward life and its enlistment on the part of educated young people. A five-day-a-week emphasis upon this type of education has contributed to society two or three generations of youth who are unusually well-prepared to carry out the obligations of an industrially-conceived citizenship.

When one inquires what common religious legacy have these children received from the Sunday-school movement, he is forced to admit there is not any such heritage. On the other hand, churches were educating their children according to the particular historical values that gave individuality to the sect. The Roman Catholics still depend in large measure upon one basis of religious instruction for their children. The Jews divided their religious testimony in the Sunday school; some groups stressed historic Hebrew orthodoxy, others Biblical liberalism, or extreme socialistic doctrine. Many were Zionist in training; not a few opposed the movement, while others were utterly indifferent to this particular cause. To make matters more confusing, Jews combined these diverse ethnic attitudes in a wide variety of synagogue appeals. Overshadowing every Jewish effort in America was the problem of the Hebrew language, which its leaders considered prerequisite to the interpretation of their time-honored religion.¹²

Examining the Protestant record for evidence of a harmonious faith in the Sunday schools of the past century, the investigator faces a more disappointing situation than that which pertained to the Jews. The children of the Christian

¹¹ For a graphic chart of the evolution of the elementary school curriculum see Cubberley, *op. cit.*, p. 327.

¹² Gamoran, *op. cit.* II, pp. 1-7.

reformation were hopelessly divided into more than a hundred different categories, according to the specific doctrines that divided sects. Not only that, but whereas the Jews had allocated several hours per week to the Sunday school, and the Romanists a few hours, the Protestants had been content to conserve one hour for this indoctrinational work. The consequent outcome of a century of religious education in America left with it a primary emphasis upon loyalty to those tenets in religion that divide Christians and Jews into separatistic sects, the youthful conception of religion as a sacred experience having to do especially with other worldly life interests; and withal, on the basis of the time at the disposal of Sunday schools, a smattering of information that was supposed to give the child a cherished "spiritual" status in his own group and in God's estimation.

From the point of view of American children, what then may be said to represent the cultural product of a hundred years of independent Church and State function in popular education? The children have been introduced to two types of Western culture; one "secular," the other "religious." In the first, all shared the same thorough grounding; in the latter there was a wide diversity of emphasis. The week-day school work was carried on twenty-five hours a week in every section of the country under the law of compulsory child attendance; the Sunday school chose one or more hours per week to teach such children as chose voluntarily to attend. While the tax-supported school has been engaged in fitting youth for citizenship in a scientific age and in a rising industrial order of society, the Sunday school has been offering a course of instruction in religious loyalty that tended to divide communities and incite sectarian prejudices; at the same time it guaranteed the individual peace with God and security in the face of an evil world and death. Secularism has been inclined to emphasize a mechanistic and commercial philosophy of life with much opportunity for individual initiative. Religion has based its claims upon

a superrational authority resident in institution, book, or belief, attempting to keep its adherents in conformity to divine sanction, and to cultivate personal piety as the chief expression of the Christian way of life.

No effort was made to harmonize the two cultures in terms of any inclusive life purpose. During this century such youth as were exposed to both trainings tended to order their characters in keeping with the independent emphases of the parallel systems of education. Among many of the most respectable supporters of both agents, it was assumed to be ethically sound to permit the principles of secularism to control behavior in the work-a-day world, while the norms of religion were reserved for conduct theistically-centered or for ecclesiastical occasions.¹³ Inheriting a constitutional prerogative that separated the functions of Church and State in the field of education of the young, American leaders found themselves facing a cultural situation fraught with great danger in the opening years of the present century.¹⁴

III. THE PRIORITY OF PERSONAL CHARACTER IN CHURCH AND STATE EDUCATION

Public schoolmen and churchmen working somewhat independently have lately discovered the common peril in their educational plans. The old center of gravity in all schools was the course of study. This view-point gave children a knowledge content, but not necessarily right and sufficient motivation for living well. It provided youth with two sets of information in Church and State, with corresponding types of conduct control. The outcome of this procedure became more and more unsatisfactory to representatives of secularism and religion. They were not producing fit men and women to meet the

¹³ Of course, there were exceptions to this stress; as, for instance, certain Christians and churches that opposed the slavery business, and later the saloon. But, if one examines the curriculum of the Sunday schools for the nineteenth century for evidences of materials bearing upon social ethics from the democratic and Christian point of view, he will find relatively none.

¹⁴ For a fuller statement of the nature of this "peril," see *The Teaching Work of the Church*, Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, pp. 20-28.

human demands of a high-powered urban civilization. Through a period of rather rapid change in educational philosophy, the center of interest in the school has shifted from the course of study to the child, from much information to more personality, from "job" specialization to socialized character.¹⁵ In progressive school circles of Church and State, the priority of personal character stands forth today as the keystone in educational building.¹⁶

Several social movements in American life contributed to the discovery of the child in educational policy. Psychologists were resigning their faith in the "faculty" conception of the human mind, the science that lent pedagogical support to the knowledge emphasis in the schools. These experimentalists discovered that persons behaved as individuals rather than in terms of "will," "memory," "feeling," or "reason," and that the diverse functionings of personality required reorganization and socialization in the school. History, civics, and the other social sciences threw light upon the type of society in which people lived and the nature of the human forces that controlled it. Resort to life-interests of the young instead of to monitorial discipline, became the chief source of teaching appeal. Under the great influence of such creative leaders as John Dewey and W. H. Kilpatrick, the school is inclined to become a miniature world society, in which children learn to live in fellowship with mutual respect for one another's rights; and in the supervision of which by the teacher the child is taught to assume an increasingly intelligent and self-governing place. The transition from school to society at graduation is then accomplished with the maximum of social efficiency.

From the point of view of the churchman, he began to

¹⁵ Cubberley unfolds this change in method and spirit with considerable care; *op. cit.*, pp. 365-70. See also W. H. Kilpatrick, *Education for a Changing Civilization*, and John and Evelyn Dewey, *Schools of Tomorrow*.

¹⁶ To assume that this progressive policy has yet become the controlling pattern throughout either public- or church-school areas, would be quite contrary to fact. See Agnes de Lima, *Our Enemy the Child*, for backward conditions in the elementary schools of the State. For a description of conditions in the typical Sunday school, see T. G. Soares, *Religious Education*, pp. 261-66.

recognize and respect the native rights of the child as he became emancipated from the dogma that God made all infants alike and that original sin had left the same tragic blight upon all infant souls. Some leaders shared Horace Bushnell's faith that children could be so nourished in the Christian faith that they need never "fall away" into sin and require the experience of the "new birth." The social gospeler became burdened with the tragic consequence of child labor in industry and commercial vices in the large city. Extreme sectarian emphases were passing, and a new interest in universal "Christian essentials" was encouraged, permitting men to see face to face and to take conference about "matters that counted." One has only to mention the names of such religious leaders as C. F. Kent and George A. Coe, to remind the reader of the growing company of religious educators who have aligned their forces in recent years to give professional voice to the rights and opportunities of the child in modern churchmanship.

The two-nature conception of the child with its school counterpart stressing independent "secular" and "religious" phases of life-investment, stands disapproved. Progressive agents of Church and State are both inquiring today: Given the scholastic resources at our disposal and respecting our socially-defined responsibility in a democracy, what can we do to enrich and beautify the personal characters of the children under our supervision? In 1918 the National Education Association wrote into its series of public school aims, the cardinal need for ethical character.¹⁷ Later, this fellowship of public schoolmen defined its concern more definitely as "the development of a citizenship capable of sustaining a socialized, industrial democracy." The International Council of Religious Education, speaking for evangelical Protestantism, has conceived its goal "to reconstruct human experience in terms of the Chris-

¹⁷ Bulletin No. 35, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, Bureau of Education, Washington. H. N. Sherwood presents the point of view of the N. E. A. in the article "What the State Is Doing for Character Education and What It Is Not Doing," *Religious Education*, June, 1927, pp. 569-73; see also "Character and the Schools," by the same schoolman, *op. cit.*, Jan., 1929, pp. 71-74.

tian way of life " in order that men may overcome " the essentially pagan character of many of the dominating motives of our present social order." ¹⁸ Both Jewish and Roman Catholic parties are contending for character education in their respective bodies, though they insist, as do many Protestants, that morality without the religious sanction is inadequate in child training. ¹⁹ The Religious Education Association, a fellowship of liberal Christians and Jews, has selected the subject " Responsibility for Character Education Within the Community " as its convention theme in March, 1929. The major concern of all educators at the present time is a more competent moral undergirding of the children of America.

Ideally, schoolmen of State and Church (and synagogue) appear to agree upon the child locus in education and the necessity of the development of socialized character for enlistment in a democracy. When the educators proceed to work out this ideal in actual practise, differences of method arise that paralyze unified effort. To return to the New England policy of theocratic schools and make central the modern stress upon character, is quite out of order constitutionally and ethnically. Or, to permit the religion of humanism to find its way into the control of a universal system of character education, is forbidden by popular ecclesiastical judgment. Not only that, but there is no *modus operandi* that meets the approval of the representatives of the sects. Ecclesiastical traditions, bases of authority, types of religious values, stand in the way of harmonious commitment to a school program. The only available technique to carry out the freshly-conceived and urgently-needed character education program in America appears to be the continuance of the two systems of Church and State schools.

Does not this decision throw education back upon the two-

¹⁸ "A Primary Function of the International Council," Hugh S. Magill, *International Journal of Religious Education*, Feb., 1926, p. 6.

¹⁹ For the Catholic view, see "Recent Developments in Catholic Religious Education," John M. Cooper, *Religious Education*, Feb., 1928, pp. 45-50; for the Jewish view, "Limitations of Public Education: The Jewish View," Louis L. Mann, *Religious Education*, June, 1927, pp. 588-91. The religious sanction in each case is conceived sectarianly.

fold culture which developed in the nineteenth century with its grave danger both to public morals and to religion in a democracy? It may, though not necessarily. It does mean that "secular" and "religious" educations will continue, though without the sharp distinctions which have characterized them. That a *moral* gulf must remain between them with disrespect (unintentional though it was) for the supreme value of religion in life, by virtue of the secondary place it received in public emphasis, is not conceded.²⁰ Should an intelligent experiment be inaugurated in character education within the tax-supported schools and an allied project be instituted in church and synagogue schools in terms of the sect's religious traits and sanctions, the cultural peril can be met; that is, provided the leaders in both educational schemes take counsel together out of regard for the best interests of their common treasure, the children of America. Agreement at this juncture sets a new pattern of educational problems for cooperating schoolmen in twentieth century democracy.

IV. HOW FAR CAN CHURCH AND STATE COOPERATE IN SCHOOL POLICY?

It is difficult for most churchmen to get the view-point of the public-school man in the present disturbing situation.²¹ Protestants are usually more handicapped than other religionists for the reason that the public school has perpetuated to this day evangelically Christian concessions from pre-Revolutionary-War times. To witness the school's relinquishment of these ties is looked upon by them as the loss of a trademark of nationality; they fail, however, to see that to continue these

²⁰ Experiments in character education are as yet in the "trial and error" stage of development. There is no sufficient agreement among those who advocate "direct" methods or "indirect" methods, far less between the two types. Yet, the leaders believe that an "intelligent" technique will rise out of the serious inquiry they are making. W. W. Charters' book, *The Teaching of Ideals*, supports "direct" moral education; G. A. Coe, *Law and Freedom in the School*, encourages the "indirect" method.

²¹ A good, though brief, statement of this view-point is found in, "The Limitations of Church Education as Seen by Schoolmen," N. G. Clark, *Religious Education*, June, 1927, pp. 592-99.

practises is an unjust religious discrimination. A case in point is the reading of the Bible in the public schools. How many Christians realize that the teacher's use of the King James Version (the one usually employed) is a resort to a sectarian instrument of religion? Some Christians, instead of making personal readjustment to the secularization of public education, still issue demands for a very definite instruction in religion.²² Of course, the subject matter of this religion is supposed to be free from sectional differences. But T. G. Soares has shown on historical and psychological grounds how absurd it is to try to conceive "religion" in terms of a specific content, apart from the tenets of the particular religious group to which a man gives his loyalty. "We can only educate young people in our own religion, not in some common denominator of everybody's religion."²³ State educators may agree upon a universal program of ethical training, but a religious course of study that respects the commonwealth of faiths which prosper in America while at the same time it provides an adequate content of religious materials, probably lies quite beyond the jurisdiction of the public school.

The secular official serves a clientele that, for the present interest, includes Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews, minor sects, and non-sectarians. It behooves him to train the children of these diverse religious groupings in a culture that is thoroughly American. How hard these religionists make this task is noted when the reader compares the attitudes each party

²² Luther A. Weigle represents this position, "The Secularization of Public Education," *Religious Education*, Feb., 1926, p. 93; also by the same author, "What the Church Is Doing for Character Education and What It Is Not Doing," *Religious Education*, June, 1927, p. 575. Weigle's request for more religion in the public school is the echo of Protestant demands repeated in each generation since secular education became established. Note, A. A. Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52; E. P. Cubberley, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-76; G. A. Coe, *Social Theory of Religious Education*, pp. 260-62.

²³ *Religious Education*, pp. 66-70; Professor H. H. Horne recommends an accommodation of the practise which Soares repudiates. He says: "What we need in the American public school is not the teacher of religion but the religious teacher. The religious teacher is one who handles all truth reverently, who senses the presence of God in the daily round and the common task of the school life, who can assist boys and girls to harmonize their knowledge of science with their experience of religion, who can convey an appreciation of the spiritual truths which make literature great, who can present the moving picture of religion in human history, and who can associate religious convictions with moral conduct . . ." *International Journal of Religious Education*, Oct., 1928, pp. 13-14.

takes toward the public school. The Roman Catholic recognizes the fundamentally unscientific theory of State education in that it ignores the most important nature of the child, its soul. Hence, the parochial school is essential to Catholics, in order that all secular knowledge may be related with the crowning moral and religious precepts for the full control of the individual's life.²⁴

Though Protestants have no single position on the question, many are apprehensive of Romanist encroachments in the school system, and for one reason or another, they desire to preserve the historic dominance of their influence in American education. The Jews have agreed that every vestige of religious exercises should be ruled out of the nation's program, for the reason that they still suffer from partial favors extended Christians through the school's use of Christmas and Easter seasons and through the reading of the Christian's Bible. "The public school is the public's school." "Religion is a concern of the individual alone, a matter between a man and his God."²⁵ Non-sectarians, increasing rapidly in America, are vigorously opposed to the introduction of the religious element in public schools, conceiving religion, as they do, in terms of asceticism or provincial and ethnic loyalty, thus denaturalizing the life of the child. The situation is the more embarrassing because most schoolmen are themselves devoted to a particular sect and find it difficult to function impartially in their professional work.²⁶

If the Church leader has difficulty in comprehending the plight which the public-school man suffers, it is probably just as true that the servant of the State experiences hardship in

²⁴ "Limitations of Public Education: The Catholic View," Jas. H. Ryan, *Religious Education*, June, 1927, pp. 582-85; "Character Education in the Catholic Church," George Johnson, *Religious Education*, Jan., 1929, pp. 54-57.

²⁵ Pamphlet, "Why the Bible Should Not Be Read in the Public Schools," published by Central Conference of American Rabbis, Committee on Church and State, 1922; "Attitudes of Churches as to Respective Spheres of Church and State in Religious Education," G. B. Smith, *Religious Education*, April, 1927, pp. 363-67.

²⁶ J. O. Engleman, presumably writing as a representative of the public school, finds difficulty in setting aside his Protestant interest in the theme: "What Cooperation Do Schoolmen Want from the Church?" *Religious Education*, June, 1927, pp. 618-21.

understanding the will of the clergy. And yet mutual appreciation of each other's cultural problem with the will to cooperate in as far as the best interests of America's childhood are involved, is imperative. Public-school men often become quite impatient with the church's conservatism, believing that it continues archaic practises which have little or no purpose in child life when it should be employing its resources for more pragmatic ends. However true this may be in some instances, these men often fail to understand the genius of religion and to give it due evaluation in the larger affairs of life and destiny. Secular psychology applied to religion can never substitute for psychology of religion in attempting to estimate the function of faith in man's struggle for the better life. Perhaps the churchman is in a better position to define his own task than is the lay schoolman to condemn it. One important definition he makes is: that, whereas the public school must serve the needs of the State and follow its course of ethical persuasion on civic questions, the Church, remaining free to exercise its divine prerogative, must transcend the ethics of nationalism and conceive of its member's conduct in terms of the rights and the good-will of all mankind.²⁷

Aside from the particular religious rites which each sect propagates among its own youth, which may have very significant value for the development of character, there are certain common difficulties facing the church and synagogue which the schoolman may very well recognize. Thus far the Sunday-school movement has been manned with unprofessional lay people who do not make the wisest use of the limited time at their disposal for religious education. The burden of leadership training in parish work is a troublesome one. Parishioners have not learned how to give reasonable budget considerations to children's work.

²⁷ G. A. Coe has drawn this distinction carefully: "The Problem Defined," *Religious Education*, June, 1927, pp. 564-68. The writer recognizes the difference between what religionists are privileged to do in a national emergency and what they actually choose to do. The practise of the sects in the World War and the recent deliveries of many of them on the subject of war and peace make strange contrasts in religious policy.

Where men and women are fit to lead and the economic need is met and when the churches make request of the local Board of Education for free-time from the public school for instruction of the children in religion, it is difficult to get affirmative action. While representatives of the State preempt all available teaching time because the curriculum content has become so complex that they require every single hour to cover the material, spokesmen for the Church defend the justice of their request by calling attention to the wholesale spiritual illiteracy in the community and the consequent wide-spread lawless behavior.²⁸ The Week-Day School of Religion movement has not only to master the high standards of administration imposed upon it by the demands of the public, but it has also the exasperating task of winning a fair share of the child's study time from the well-established public-school system. What is required in this case are men whose decisions are tempered by the rights of the child rather than by the jealous demands of either or both institutions. A life-centered school policy in State and Church has yet to be drawn and demonstrated. When that cherished ideal has become operative in American democracy it will have the approval and direction of two types of educational leaders, who, honoring their respective schools, honor children more.

²⁸ Rabbi Louis L. Mann suggests the high degree of illiteracy among his people, "Limitations of Public Education: The Jewish View," *Religious Education*, June, 1927, p. 589; W. S. Athearn has presented a graphic picture of conditions within Christianity, *Character Building in a Democracy*, chap. I.

WHO IS ORTHODOX?

Not a Creedal Shibboleth, but a Spiritual Principle ¹

Professor SPENSER B. MEESER

The writer of this article makes claim to be a Contemporaryist and holds that no creed is of any value to a man morally or spiritually unless it is up-to-date in the sense that it is vitally connected with and "works" in his own life and conduct. He is not a Fundamentalist and has no formal creed to present as a test of orthodoxy. On the other hand he is not a Modernist with some alternate creed to propose, and has no intention to offer a criticism of the Fundamentalist creed. Neither is he a Middle-of-the-Roadster who may claim that it makes no difference what one believes.

He is here not interested in what some men call "the faith once for all delivered to the saints"—a phrase taken from a Biblical context which shows that "the faith" referred to has nothing to do with theological creeds, but is "the faith in right living"; though many are disposed to identify their shibboleths with this "the faith once delivered."

Nor is the writer interested in the so-called "faith of the fathers" no matter what name may be attached to it. He is interested in a present-day living dynamic faith, such as functions (whatever its content) in a man's life to the production of the fruit of right Christian character and conduct.

This question, "Who is orthodox?" was asked in a letter received some time ago. The writer of the letter requested permission to use the reply in a paper to be presented to a company of ministers. The question was probably put to a number of teachers of theology. Most of us can see through a stone wall—when it has a hole in it. The permission to use it was freely given, though I never knew whether it was used or not.

The following was the answer submitted: "He is orthodox whose views of God, or Jesus Christ, of man and their mutual relations, are such as lead him to love as God loves, to live as

¹A paper read before the Baptist Minister's Conference of Norfolk, Va., and Vicinity, and though, in the main, previously published, is reproduced, with additions to the original, at the unanimous request of the ministers who heard it read.—EDITOR.

Jesus Christ lived, and to be a brother to his fellow men. The only true and adequate test of the correctness of a man's views is their result in his life. Absolutely there is no (Baptist) dogmatic by which a man's beliefs may be judged. The basis of our fellowship is participation in a common life in Christ, not a form of doctrine; and from the point of view of our constitution as churches, the only heretic is one who ventures to propound a dogmatic creed and test men by it."

Such an answer proposes if not a new, at least an uncommon meaning for the word "orthodox." It intimates that a moral and spiritual significance lies in the word. This is, in fact, the implicit in the common use of it. To say that a man is "orthodox," while it may refer to an intellectual assent to a body of doctrines, is also meant to imply something morally or religiously commendable; while to say of a man that he is "heretical" ("radical" is the popular modern symbol) implies something discreditable morally. To make this implicit meaning of the word the explicit sense of it is not, therefore, so novel as to be without justification; and the above reply to the questioner is meant to give this emphasis. We have too long applied the merely intellectual test. Jesus is reported in the Scriptures to have applied the test of character and conduct.

Indeed the idea of orthodoxy has several meanings and the word has several uses. In the historical sense, he is orthodox who subscribes to the body of doctrines which were discussed in the historic councils of the Church, and were formulated in the historic "creeds." These symbols, the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds with the Apostles' Creed, difference the Christian doctrine from the faith of the Jews and the Græco-Roman religion. In the Reformation period other bodies of doctrine, the Augsburg and the Heidelberg Confessions, were put into form and became the basis of church organization, differencing the Protestant from the Roman Catholic. For the Protestant, he is orthodox then who consents to the standard of faith thus set forth. In the later Reformation

period, these standards were increased in number by the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession of Faith. Each of these Creeds constituted a measure of theological orthodoxy. Protestantism was divided in idea and in ideal; and the foundations of denominationalism were laid. We thus come upon another sense of the word, orthodox—the denominational. Now, for each of the two hundred or more sects, the word has generally the meaning of assent to the particular tenets of that body; but the word is used freely and loosely to cover either the historic or the denominational implications; or both.

In the strictest sense the Baptists are not a Protestant or Reformation body. They had their beginnings not in protest to the Roman Catholic Church, but in dissent to the Protestant Reform. They are dissenters, not reformers. And this is true, whether their dissent is thought to maintain the continuity, and is simply the modern expression of that non-conformity which is traceable through the history of the church, or was indeed initiated in the first half of the seventeenth century. The Reformed Churches were all constituted by adherents to some body of doctrines. They are churches of a creed. The dissenters did not refuse conformity to any one of these creeds, primarily or particularly; but to a practise or practises. These practises, of course, have their ground in definite ideas of the nature of religion and of the church; and so the refusal of the practises involved the refusal of these ideas. But, in the main, as The London Confession was meant to reveal, the theological views of the Baptists were in accord with the doctrines of the church as a whole.

For the dissenters Christianity is first a life; and then, if ever, a creed. The constitution of a true church, they insisted, is to be found in the participation by its members in a common life; and is not to be found in a common intellectual assent to a body of doctrines. Therefore, the Baptists as a whole have never had a Creed or Confession; nor have they in common consented to a theology. No ecumenical council of the Bap-

tists has ever been called, and no common declaration of faith has ever been made. This is simply a fact of history. The nearest approach to such a council is to be found in The Baptist World Alliance, the first meeting of which was held in London in 1905. This was not a thoroughly organized and representative body, however; nor was it called to consider matters of faith, or to devise a Baptist Confession. We did indeed have a narrow escape from embodying in the constitution of that Alliance a creedal statement that might, for good or for ill, have served all the purposes of such a confession. But that is a story in itself.

As to the moral and spiritual sense of "orthodox," implicit in all the uses of the word, and here brought into view, we hold to the text of our reply to the questioner above referred to: "He is orthodox whose ideas, etc."

But it will be objected: Granting that the end and purpose of any body of beliefs is their ministry to a true and spiritual life; and, granting that the creed is not an end in itself, but is to function in producing moral and religious character; granting this—which seems to need no argument for its validity—is not an authoritative, a definitely certified and divinely revealed body of beliefs, accepted by all, a *sine-qua-non* of the production of such common life in all men? If belief has any function in relation to life; if truth is the instrument of the divine Spirit; if the mediation of ideas is, in any sense, essential to the development of right character and right conduct, must not the ideas be the same, and the creed one in form and substance for all to produce right life in each soul? Must we not have like causes for like effects?

We submit this alternative as true:

If it be admitted that moral character and spiritual life are the end and aim of all our intellectual and voluntary religious activity, then whatever ideas best function to this end in any individual are, for him, not only allowable but justified. I am not saying that "it makes no difference what a man believes."

Rather, I am affirming that it makes every difference in the world what a man believes; every difference in the development and the achieving of character. If it made no difference what a man believed, then indeed any common creed, any confession of faith would do as well as any other; but if it makes a difference, then he is in duty bound to question critically every doctrine offered for his acceptance; to determine how far it will function in his life to the one end of Christian character; to seek for what most and best will minister to this ideal and then make these the working, dynamic principles of his life. It is just because one's character and conduct are so vitally and psychologically linked to his beliefs that he should accept only such as most contribute to his ideal of what his life ought to be; whether those doctrines be included in church's Creed or are anathematized by it.

No one can determine beforehand what will be the reactions of any group of men to any single doctrine, much less to a group of teachings. The fund of experience and observation is, for no two men, exactly the same; the mass of moral insights and the angle of vision vary with each individual. And yet these inevitably determine the value of any idea or doctrine so far as its power to affect one's character is concerned. What ministers to deeper reverence or devotion in one man may arouse feelings of aversion or even resentment in others. Unless the psychological reactions to a common form of belief, by all who subscribe to it, are the same, or at least equally beneficial in the religious sense, it must be clear that possibly other forms of belief might be found to be more beneficial to those least benefited or not benefited at all. To insist on conformity is, therefore, possibly sometimes immoral. But short of such a conclusion is the fact that differing types of religious susceptibility and experience normally demand variety in forms of belief, purely as a matter of fitness and power to minister to the common end of attaining fellowship with God and right moral character in Christ.

The fundamental question is: What views, doctrines, ideas of God, Christ, man, and their mutual relations will best work in persuading and enabling a man to love as God loves, live as Christ lived, and be a brother to his fellow men? For instance: If a man finds that his moral judgment confirms the idea of the Bible as a verbally inspired record of the will of God; and he believes that some presidency of the Spirit is conceivable through all the centuries of its unfolding revelation, such as to constitute it "a verbum dei" capable of application spiritually to the varying needs of many men; and if such a view of the Bible makes its truth most powerful in his life and carries most effectively the imperatives of the spiritual life to love, live, and treat his fellows in godly way, then for him that is the best way of conceiving the Bible, and it is doubtful wisdom which leads teacher or church to discredit him with the opprobrium of being a "traditionalist."

Or again: If one accept the Church's historic faith as to the person of Christ, the miraculous birth, the proper and unique divinity of our Lord; if in his life Jesus Christ has all the value of, and functions for him as God; if such faith so controls the believer that Jesus Christ dominates his will and heart so that he loves as God, and lives the life of Christ among men—then, whatever may be the judgment of the man's intellectual processes, and his power of reasoning, it is true and right for him to hold such view, and to disfellowship him as a "reactionary" or a "mossback" is moral stupidity.

Or again: If to a man the personal bodily advent of our Lord is a precious and dynamic hope, and the idea of a millennial reign on earth by Jesus, after such an advent, satisfies the moral and religious aspirations of his heart; and if in anticipation of such a happening he is inspired to more vigorous charity to his fellow men and a more Christlike life; and if this view of last things works more efficiently in him than the spiritual interpretation of Christ's coming—then, while one may not easily recognize the supposed superior values of the view,

nevertheless its moral results in him are its justification for him; and to deride him as a fanatic or avoid him as an alien is to violate every principle of religious freedom and of brotherly spirit.

On the other hand the principle works for those who hold less current views. It's a poor principle that will not work both ways. Look at the situation in this direction. For instance: If a man finds that some doctrine of the Bible, other than the theory of infallible, verbal inspiration of its writings, makes the Book a greater utility and power in his life, more certainly brings him into touch with the power of God, and better enables him to love as God loves or live as Christ lived—if this doctrine of his better ministers to his need to attain Christly character, then his view is right for him, allowable, and justified; and to stigmatize him as a "heretic" is a blind folly on the part of the church.

Or again: If the theory of evolution, conceived as the method by which God brought the universe and its variety of beings into existence, is one which, to his mind and heart, more surely glorifies God than the theory of a fiat-creation; if the evolutionary process seems the more normal and rational conception of the present activity of God, and such a conception best enables him to give himself to the influences and power of the Divine Spirit—then every law of psychology and every principle of Christ is violated by forbidding such a doctrine or by refusing fellowship to him who holds the view.

Once more: If one sincerely finds the current conception of God as One who needs propitiation before he can or will forgive and save men—if he finds this doctrine repugnant to his own idea of a moral God and discredited by the revelation of God in Jesus Christ; and if he holds to Paul's doctrine of the grace of God in Jesus Christ, believing that Jesus came to save men from sin rather than to save them from God; and if this doctrine most and best aids him in loving God, in forgiving as God forgives, and in living like Christ—then he is orthodox in

the only worthy Christian sense, and it is the infatuation of dogmatism to stamp him with theological odium.

One may raise the question—"Is there then no absolute religious and moral truth?" Well—possibly! though long experience should have made clear to all that no department of human knowledge has sanely claimed to have attained it, or at least been able to vindicate the claim. Is not all truth at best relative, conditioned by the form of reality to be known and the subject functioning to know, his powers of perception and particularly his apperceptive or experience fund?

Even supposing "absolute truth" could be achieved, who has it? How will one know it when he sees it? How and by what signs shall we recognize it? How better than by its fruits in the life—love, life, brotherhood?

Or some few may ask, naïvely perhaps, "Isn't that absolute truth in the Bible?" Of course that is what many, with a great faith and earnestness, are uncritically claiming. But one hesitates even to intimate that an informed person will not ask that question, for he will know that there must be asked in response, Who of the writers has it? How shall we know it to accept it; as Paul presents it, or as John, or the Synoptics? Or which of the Old Testament writers, the priestly or the prophetic group? And if a synthesis or harmony of the whole is offered, who shall make it, and by what signs shall we know it—the absolute among the relative?

One would suppose then there were sufficient reason for the church to question the infallibility of its creeds and its methods of dealing with men in the propagation of those creeds. The church is itself divided by the various confessions of faith. It has failed to impress even itself with its own affirmations, while the world reels on into sin, because men have too often made a creed of some sort the touchstone of salvation; and the Christian life has been conceived as an intellectual form, rather than as a moral and spiritual activity. If we made loving as God loves, living as Christ lived, and right moral relation to our

fellow men the goal of all revelation, of all salvation, and of all Christian activity, we would not be long in recognizing that that faith is "orthodox" which best contributes to this end, however varied and apparently diverse the individual ideas might appear to be.

What difference does a particular creed or theology or faith, supposed to be superior, make in the life of the church which confesses it? Does it make it better than some others? Does it make the members more nearly like God and Christ—less wicked, less envious, less malicious or covetous than other men? If not, why seek to have others accept it, or demand that they follow it, and what difference does it make whether another accepts it or rejects it? If it makes no difference in him who holds it, it is not true—for him. Why think it must be true for another? Theological "orthodoxy" is but relative—relative to the progressive revelation and the changing forms of theological opinion. The genuine test of any man's creed is the kind of life it helps to produce in him. The absolute orthodoxy is moral and spiritual.

If it be objected that such a proposition would issue in innumerable creeds, each personal and individual, we regret to say that the probability of this is pathetically remote; for alas, too few Christians are able to give any, much less a good reason, for the faith that is in them. If they could be induced to do so, we should have not a less, but a more vital and energetic Christianity. From the point of view of those who crave an authoritative standard and unity of "faith" in the intellectual sense, the result assumed would of course be lamentable. But once more the question arises, "What is the goal, the aim, the intent, the essential purpose of religion?" Is it unity of creed, agreement of theological views, a universal intellectual statement of doctrine? Is it not rather the achievement of righteousness, the bringing of men into effective relation to God in Christ for salvation from sin; the issue of universal righteousness? Surely no one would claim that all the creeds in

Christendom are worth the sacrifice of the effective working of God in each and all hearts to the production of righteous character. If the personal creed, the creed which is the conviction of a living experience best achieves this end, it is adequately justified.

If this does not represent the historically first in our existence as (Baptist) churches; if it is not today the very soul of our body; if we are to be lined up with the Reformed or creedal churches; if we are about to sell our birthright or liberty for the pottage of a prescribed creed; then, in either of these cases, it is time that a new order of churches should arise, in which the condition of Christian membership and the goal of all religious activity should be the achievement of Christly character and the persuasion of all men to love as God loved, to live as Jesus Christ lived, and to be brothers to their fellow men. To this end fellowship should be granted to all who have found a working theology that is for them effective; no other test being applied than the moral dynamic their theology has for them. The only conformity required should be the conformity that the Spirit of Jesus justifies, namely, conformity to the ideal of the personal righteousness spoken and lived by him.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

DOCTOR GAIUS GLENN ATKINS, we are sure, will be recognized as an able preacher and author. At present he is Professor of Homiletics in Auburn (N. Y.) Theological Seminary. Doctor of Divinity by University of Vermont and Dartmouth and L. H. D. by University of Vermont, he served in the Pastorate of the Congregational Church for thirty years and more. Among his books are: *Things That Remain*, 1911; *Pilgrims of the Lonely Road*, 1913; *The Maze of the Nations*, 1915; *The Godward Side of Life*, 1917; *Jerusalem Past and Present*, 1918; *The Undiscovered Country*, 1922; *Modern Religious Cults and Movements*, 1923; *Craftsmen of the Soul*, 1925; *Reinspecting Victorian Religion and The Making of the Christian Mind*. He was awarded Church Peace Union Prize for essay on International Peace, 1914. American director *Foyer du Soldat* with French army, 1918.

EVERETT C. HERRICK, President of Newton Theological Institution, is a graduate of Colby University of Newton Seminary and Harvard University Divinity School, and a Doctor of Divinity from Colby and Brown Universities. It is especially a pleasure to present Doctor Herrick to our readers.

THE Managing Editor is glad to welcome to the pages of THE CROZER QUARTERLY his old friend, William J. Thompson, who holds degrees in course from University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, New York University, and Drew Theological Seminary. He served pastorates in Washington, D. C.; Worcester, Mass.; Newtonville, Mass.; and Brooklyn, New York. For the past seventeen years he has been Professor of the Psychology of Religion in Drew Theological Seminary, and is a contributor to Methodist periodicals.

DOCTOR LEE S. MCCOLLESTER is dean of the Crane Theological School, Tufts College School of Religion. His brief paper is in response to the request of the Editor for a clear statement of the present mind and aim of the Universalist Churches; and the topic, which is seen to be appropriate, was suggested to him by the Editor. Doctor McCollester was for a long time an exceedingly loved and honored pastor, whose fellowship was valued by all ministers associated with him, of whom this writer is one. We thank him for his perspicuous writing.

PROFESSOR STEWART G. COLE, of the Faculty of Crozer, needs no introduction to our readers. His paper was read before the Baptist Ministers Conference of New York City and Vicinity, and its publication was requested.

THE EDITOR, SPENSER B. MEESER, hesitates to present a paper from his pen since his *Notes and Discussions* afford him some opportunity each issue of the *QUARTERLY*. The note attached explains the appearance of this paper.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES

I. G. MATTHEWS

THE activities of the last year in the archæological field have proved to be most rewarding, even though little of an unusually startling nature has been brought to light. But gaps are being filled in in the field of ancient history, slightly supported theories are being confirmed or overthrown, general adjustment is being made, and the horizon of knowledge is ever being enriched and widened.

Under the British mandate permission to dig in Palestine and Iraq is readily granted to any school that is equipped to do *bona fide* work in the field, and half of the finds become the property of the school. Hence there is a rapidly awakening interest and a splendid response on the part of those who recognize the importance of such work for Biblical customs and history.

The archæological societies and great Universities of England, Germany, and France, as well as those of many of the smaller European countries are, to the extent of their abilities, garnering the spoils of the long-buried civilizations and thereby are enriching their material for the study of cultural history. The British Museum, the University of London, Oxford University, and others, are yearly adding to their collections those treasures that in the future will not only attract the casual sight-seer, but will make these institutions the Mecca of scholarship.

American interest is not lagging. The University of Pennsylvania for years has been in the very forefront of such intellectual enterprise. Her Oriental scholarship and her field expeditions have given her a very enviable position in academic circles. Her Museum is rapidly becoming an attractive center to those interested in the history and culture of the past. At

the present time no work is more rewarding than that the University is carrying on in "Ur of the Chaldees" and in Beisan.

The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago is a more recent comer into the field. The University of Chicago has a splendid record of activities reaching back some thirty years, under R. F. Harper in Nippur and J. H. Breasted in Egypt. More recently increased activities and a new outlook have created a new organization, the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago under the directorship of Doctor Breasted. This is the biggest thing of the kind ever launched. Thanks to the enthusiasm and discrimination of the Director, the Institute has projected a program that has won the confidence of leaders in finance. There is good reason to believe that it is assured of financial backing adequate to do the most thorough kind of archæological work as well as the most comprehensive yet attempted. Intensive activities are being carried on and will be increased in Egypt, in the Hittite country in Asia Minor, in Megiddo in Palestine, in Nuzi in Iraq, while other related centers are already within the horizon of its interest. Splendidly staffed and handsomely financed, no doubt it will open up to the eager inquirer many a fascinating page of ancient history.

After these two great institutions follow others, each making important contributions to the sum total of ancient lore. Harvard in Samaria, in Sinai, and in Nuzi; Yale in Bagdad and later in Gerasa; Michigan in Ctesiphon; the Pacific School of Religion at Tel-en-Nesbeh and Haverford at Beth Shemesh have all placed the Biblical student under a permanent debt of gratitude.

Nor is the American School of Oriental Research least on the roll of honor. While this is not the place to trace its history or its achievements, it may be said that it has stimulated a wide-spread and intelligent interest in the excavations in Palestine and Mesopotamia and in that way has made one of the most distinguished contributions to the work of the field.

Many schools, some of them Theological Seminaries, are now awaking to the values to be derived for Biblical studies from the field work in Palestine and the building up of Museums, the material of which is illustrative of the Hebrew culture. Many important Biblical sites that are as yet untouched, conceal buried treasure that will be priceless for the interpreter. At a comparatively small outlay valuable results may be obtained. Why should not Crozer have a real part in this work and derive for herself some permanent profit from such an undertaking?

In this article, however, our chief interest is, What of value has been done during the past season? Only a few specimens of the treasure-trove can be here exhibited, but they may indicate the worth-whileness of such endeavor.

Doctor Chiera, our distinguished alumnus, had his usual good fortune, or better, the reward of industry, last summer. In the continuation of his excavations in Kirkuk, near Bagdad, he discovered some thousand more tablets, and uncovered evidences of a well-developed complex civilization belonging approximately to 1500 B. C. Copper body-armor, new types of pottery, excellent decorations, and a copper incense-burner were indications of the culture. But the ruins of an old temple, of which the walls were still standing eight feet high, with many and various rooms and chambers, proved perhaps the most interesting of all. Careful study of the details seems to prove that this temple was of different design from any hitherto known. As religious customs are always most tenacious this is significant. Where did this particular type of structure and the peculiar pottery originate? What particular religious ideas are therein expressed? The answer to these and similar questions may open an important chapter in the history of primitive religion.

Dr. E. Speiser, of the University of Pennsylvania, on a Guggenheim fellowship, spent two years in the East, chiefly in Iraq, where he made a number of important discoveries.

The uncovering in Suleimania of the remains of a city that had been destroyed 5,000 years ago and never rebuilt, fits in well with Babylonian records that tell of the victories of Sargon I in that region. Among the remains perhaps nothing arouses curiosity more than the pair of copper tweezers that after 5,000 years burial still retained their spring. Apparently those ancients had in some particulars a remarkable mastery of metals.

In Byblos in Phœnicia, among the many finds of the French as they excavated an ancient temple, was an Egyptian seal of 2600 B. C., adding one further witness to the very close relationship between Byblos and Egypt in the very early days.

At Tel-Feri, midway between Gaza and Beersheba, the expedition of Sir Wm. Flinders Petrie, under the direction of Mr. Sharkey, has met with the usual success. The framework of a couch that belonged to the Persian period attracts attention. It is made of tubular bronze rods, again shocking us by the antiquity of some of our so-called modern achievements.

The church of St. Theodore belonging to the early Christian centuries has been excavated in Gerash by Mr. J. B. Roberston of the "two brothers' " fellowship in Yale. The foundations, the general plan of building, the baptismal font and a number of inscriptions rewarded the expedition. A fountain that was found in the center of a paved court in front of the church seems to be of unusual historic interest. The water siphoned from the outside, started with sufficient elevation, so that running down a channel in the wall, it was carried under the pavement and raised in the fountain so that it overflowed the semicircular bowl. The excavator and others have been vividly reminded of the annual miracle of the turning of the water into wine that the historian Epiphanius in 375 A. D. reports to have occurred in this place. Here is all the apparatus by which a priesthood eager to strengthen the faith of a credulous people could produce evidence of a wonder-working Deity.

In Palestine proper the excavations have contributed their due quota. At the site of the ancient Beth Shemesh Dr. E. Grant, of Haverford College, began work last springtime. It was found that no city had been built here since 600 B. C., rather convincing evidence of the effectiveness of the Babylonian invasion of 597 and 586 B. C. It corroborates the Biblical picture of the complete ruin of the Judean civilization. Beneath the surface lay city after city, going back to about 2000 B. C. Among other things a number of beautiful Astarte plaques belonging to the thirteenth century B. C. were found, which along with such a passing phrase as "a goodly Babylonish garment" (Josh. 7: 21) give growing support for early Babylonian religious influence in Palestine. Evidences of serpent-worship also seem to have been found. This is not strange as in Beth Mirsim, Gezer, and Beisan the proof of such worship is unquestionable. We cannot then wonder that the worship of the brazen serpent was so long tolerated in Israel (2 Kings 18: 4). No trace of Philistine is found earlier than the middle of the twelfth century B. C. This coincides so completely with the reports from all the other sites excavated, Askelon, Beth Mirsim, and others, that it may be taken as one of the reasonable certainties of archæology and history. Doctor Grant plans to return in the autumn and hopes to be able to carry the work begun with such good results to its completion.

Shechem (Balata) where Doctor Sellin has been at work for some years, has again revealed the important rôle the city played in ancient days. The triple gate unearthed some three years ago assured us it was a stronghold that must have played an important part in the early racial and tribal struggles. This year the discovery of an important tower gives further evidence in the same direction. But an important altar stone that was found later is mute evidence of the religious importance of the city. Doctor Sellin suggests this may be the very stone referred to in Judges 9: 6. It surely belongs to this period.

The great temples found in Beisan, belonging to the days

of Thutmose III and Ramses II, show that Egyptian culture completely dominated this part of the country at least down to the days of David.

"Solomon's stables" have been unearthed at Megiddo. At least Mr. Guy has discovered an extensive cement floor, with indications of stall partitions and hitching-posts, that come in the 1000 B. C. strata. Naturally this has been used as a commentary on the mercantile activities of Solomon (1 Kings 10: 26-29). It is indeed an indisputable evidence of the remarkable achievements of that period. Further the work at Megiddo has added greatly to the already rich treasure in ceramics that has come from this Tell.

But for many the discoveries of Miss Garrod in the cave of Subkah, 17 miles north of Jerusalem, will be the most startling. While only a small corner of this cave has been excavated, an abundance of Mousterian flint artifacts and parts of the skull and other bones that have been identified as those of Neanderthal man have been found. These give united testimony to a civilization that passed away 25,000 years ago. They belong to the same period as the "Galilee skull" found some four years ago by Turville Petre. Miss Garrod will continue her work this year, and as there is a large area of the cave quite untouched, we may expect important finds.

The American School of Oriental Research, through the generosity of Harold M. Wiener ran a shaft down in Bethel, the city made famous by the prophet Amos. They found evidence of occupation as early as 2000 B. C. The School continued its work in conjunction with Pres. M. G. Kyle of Xenia Theological Seminary at Beth Mirsim. Like Beth Shemesh it had been abandoned 2,500 years ago. Evidence of serpent-worship was found. No Philistine remains were in strata earlier than 1150 B. C. Cyprus ware came in during the thirteenth century, and Hyksos seals were in evidence in the fifteenth century. But most interesting of all is the seal of Eliakim belonging to the closing days of the city's existence,

which in a peculiarly definite way links up the work of the spade with the documents of the Old Testament.

With great labor and infinite pains the archæologist is carefully sifting the grains of sand from these ancient mounds and slowly but surely rebuilding in story the structure of all that ancient civilization. Many a ray of light has been flashed on the pages of Scripture and still more light telling of the struggles and the triumphs of the dwellers in Palestine may be expected to break forth from hidden depths of these buried cities.

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

SPENSER B. MEESER

CHAIN-STORE RELIGION

A WRITER in February *Harper's* (1929) *Magazine* has coined a phrase which is as likely to become significant as portraying the psychological state now known as "the herd-mind." His article is entitled *The Chain-Store Mind*, and he offers many instances of how it affects the city of 25,000 people in which he does business. The chain store has characteristics the first of which is that each one is like every other in the chain; offers the same goods, in every place, at the same price, on the same days, and even the method and materials of the window display are so far as possible the same; all of which is determined or predestined by a personnel which buys in the bulk and commands the order of disposal of the goods in bulk.

With this order of business neither the author nor we are here concerned. But certain effects on the community life which parallel this method and may be traced to it, are of importance, such as the lessening of the sense of responsibility for the community life in those who direct the business; the hardening of relations between the business man and customers; a machinelike atmosphere in business which eliminates happier social relations; the tendency of the town to let others do its thinking for it, or to take its thoughts and ideas from other thinkers somewhere else. These trends reach into banking, newspapers, and even churches, where ready-made ideas imported from a headquarters are eagerly accepted, with loss, of course, of initiative and the development of local genius.

We have in view something like the Chain-Store Mind in religion and theology. In the two main streams of recent religious life and thinking, Fundamentalist and Modernist, this

tendency is strikingly evident, with little in favor of either as to real originality and relevancy. There is too often utter failure vitally to relate either religious practise or doctrine to the individual's experience of God or Christ (if such experience there be); and all too manifest disposition to "be true to the faith of our fathers" on the one hand; or to be known as in the fashion of theological opinion or religious practise of the latest academic headquarters decision. There is a theological vogue. All we like sheep go in the way of some one's orders, whose decisions we think of as authoritative—just as the local manager of the Chain-Store does.

Religion and its intellectual presentations in theology suffer from nothing more seriously than this Chain-Store mind. Initiative in religious thinking and spontaneity in spiritual endeavor are the dynamic of all effective religion, but are in discredit as heresy or revolution; or on the other hand as unwillingness to accept "the latest results," etc.

We have Chain-Store missionary endeavor, "projects of cooperative effort" we say. Denominational budgets, local church budgets, church calendars with special Sundays for all sorts of objects, and the life of the Spirit in us smothered with rituals, orders of service; something called "public worship" which presents symbols to be observed, symbols of spiritual reality that have little correspondence to the life of the worshipers. Is it not clear that this Chain-Store temper and habit must bring these effects in the religious community life which Jesse Rainsford Sprague in the *Harper's* finds in the social organism in business and bank?

Or is it desirable that each religious person should think and be as every other one in the church community? That he should offer the same brand of spiritual goods in his place as every other in his, make like confessions, all predetermined by a theological headquarters?

Then look for a lessened sense of moral responsibility, a hard machinelike atmosphere in all church activities, an end of

a rational, thinking religion service, loss of moral initiative and spontaneity in spiritual endeavor, with inevitable decline in the power and reality of religion in all its aspects.

Of course it is true that there never was so wide-spread a trend to individuality in religious life and in reaction to the deeper convictions of men's souls. Greater diversities of faith and practise, which in earlier days would have led to multiplication of sects, there never have been. We have learned the futility of organizing a church about every new theological variation. But where hundreds are thinking anew, or with vital relation to the facts and truths of their religion experience, thousands await the new cult and throng the way to adopt its view and practises; or other tens of thousands close their minds to its promise and hope. There are competitors in the Chain-Store principle, but the principle and spirit still abide.

SPIRITUAL VALUES IN PHILOSOPHIC DISCIPLINE

THE value of philosophy is very frequently called in question by the unthinking, and often discredited by those who are using philosophic method to make effective their tirade against philosophers.

In the broadest sense, philosophy is simply thinking things through in a thorough and critical manner. To reason and reason with keen critical mind is simply to use our natural mental endowments to the *n*th degree. And yet many, who would not think of discrediting mature reflection on any subject, with exact and consistent use of well-defined concepts, do not hesitate to speak sneeringly of philosophy—generally meaning some system of thought originated and developed by some single thinker or school of thinkers. And this in view of the fact that any rational disproof of this system involves the use of the same critical methods—philosophy.

We plead here for no particular system of thought when we insist that there are great spiritual values in the discipline

of the philosophic method. And we here venture to mention for reflection and criticism some of these values, which have practical intellectual worth and finally even material relevance. That is, this discipline has direct effect on the lives of those who study it and indirectly upon the lives of those with whom they are associated.

Outstandingly, of course, it is "among the goods of the mind" that these values are to be found. To these we cannot be forever indifferent. Any student knows that all the sciences—exact, descriptive, and quasi sciences—began as philosophy; and, as they achieved various degrees of exactness, were separated as sciences. Philosophy, its history shows, was the primary or origin, the beginning of all knowledge of the world and the mind; and we may expect that philosophy will some day issue in a still greater and all-inclusive science, the science of being in all its aspects.

THE study of philosophy disciplines the mind and increases the depth and breadth, the comprehensive power of the intellect. A trained mind is the supreme thing in education. With it a man has the chief instrument and power of education. Facts, information beyond a narrow sphere, no human mind can contain, and he can readily find all he can use in encyclopedias. The factor that counts in life is not how much one knows, but how well he has learned how to use what he knows. Most men know more than they can well or profitably use. What differences them is the power to use what they know in order to achieve worthy and noble ends. Many pay the price of having so much knowledge that they cannot be wise.

OTHER studies do indeed train the mind, are disciplinary also; but here, because of the depth and comprehension required, we have the supreme aid. Here any given amount of intellectual material or equipment of knowledge is made more effective by the invention or discovery of better methods in its ap-

plication to the solutions of problems. Exact science is one of the inventions of philosophy; and by its method the great generalizations of science have been achieved. Einstein is more philosopher than scientist when he conceives his theory of relativity and his theory of the unity of gravitation and the forces of electricity. All scientific theory is historically shown to be in form and method philosophical speculation until confirmed in facts; which short of universal search and experiment, remains merely hypothesis.

ONE of the special values of philosophic discipline is its tendency to deepen insight. Philosophy is not mere speculation, cloud-land meandering. On the rational supposition that the universe was somehow first thought through and out, by some master-mind, we use our minds to discover that continuity and wholeness of the world-idea in science and in philosophy. Following this trail of "the whole" in its continuity and consistency will yield to us a wealth of by-truth, related values and insights, especially in the moral and spiritual realms.

By philosophic discipline we do not mean merely the reading of systems presented in the popular histories of philosophy or the more complex world-views in their original forms. This has its increment of worth, no doubt. But we mean the use of the reflective critical method, employing one's own resources, in the effort to find a tenable theory of things. Every one has some sort of a world-view and what the world means for life; explicit or implicit he holds it and it affects his view of anything in particular. History makes clear that man takes some attitude toward life which is more or less determined by his ideas of the system of things and its meaning for him. "Philosophy and life go hand in hand," and it is important that one should endeavor to have such a view as one can justify in reason. Philosophy thus enables one to take somewhat intelligently a definite and rationally justified attitude toward life; an attitude

which is never independent of one's idea of what the world is and means.

ANOTHER has called attention to the fact that study of the problem of metaphysics if it does nothing else for one, at least, enables him to comprehend and criticize intelligently the doctrines which are presented for his acceptance by others. He is not likely to be blown about by every wind of doctrine that assails him. It is a matter of intellectual self-defense; no small concern in this day of the advocacy of subtle, insidious, and insinuating theories of incompetent thinkers. And obversely the same discipline enables him to do for his own ideas what the criticism of others may do with those ideas, often to his confusion and intellectual shame.

By no means the least of these spiritual values is what might be described as the increase of one's capacity to appreciate the wealth of the universe which may be his. For philosophy, while it may bewilder the untrained mind by the very variety and multiplicity of its concerns, and the breadth and depth of its interests, by that very complexity reveals to the trained mind the otherwise unsuspected fulness and diversity of the universe. Here is both enrichment of life and the multiplication of interests which the mind may enjoy. Life is never dull to the philosopher. His mind can never be static. There is no period to the sentence of his interest. He need never repeat his queries. New questions, new incentives, and fresh concerns crowd upon him. If he can never decide a problem finally, that gives zest to inquiry in other guise. His goal, if never fully reached, keeps him running. Satiety, ennui, distaste for life do not fall upon him. To live and to think, to begin all over again to live and reason are his supernal joys. He has the feel of eternity in him.

But this widening of intellectual interest, this enriching of his mind-world, makes everything of more meaning and sig-

nificance, creates appetite and presents well-seasoned intellectual food at the same time. Few things are more apparent to the observant man that this—that the universe is a deep well, a bubbling spring, a river of satisfactions for our soul-hunger, and that most of us dip into it only a thimbleful capacity when we might have deep draughts from golden chalicefuls. The philosopher may fail as a creative artist in any one reach of human effort, but one remembers Browning in Cleon:

I have not chanted verse like Homer, no—
Nor swept string like Terpander—no, nor carved
And painted men like Phidias and his friend:
I am not great as they are, point by point.
But I have entered into sympathy
With these four, running these into one soul,
Who separate ignored each others' arts.
Say, is it nothing that I know them all?

YET once again and we may see a trinity of values begotten of the philosophic spirit and method. It is a commonplace to say of some one who has successfully and without commotion met a new and trying situation that he met it and dealt with it like a philosopher. Here arises then this fact that the discipline begets resourcefulness, adaptability, and capacity to meet unusual situations, where novel conditions front us in our intellectual and bodily experiences. Viewing things broadly and in their wholeness brings to mind more than single instances, makes us acquainted with many alternatives in action and truth, makes clear that to any end we desire, or the solution of any problem we meet, there are many, at least several ways. One is not then shut up to some one way which may obstruct his movement. Versatility in action after versatility in outlook—he who has this fruit of intellectual training may be besieged but never captured.

Quite evidently then this capacity will result in repose in mind and life in the face of circumstances which greatly agitate, confuse, and render helpless those of less comprehending out-

look on life. The very effort, whatever the success, to come to a clear view of life and the world-as-a-whole, lifts the mind to a higher level, gives a wider view, reveals the significance of the particular in the whole, makes one conscious that in all the meanings of life the meaning of that whole is of greater value than the meaning, now possibly new, of the particular event or circumstance. In that larger comprehending view is to be found composure.

And finally, there follows a certain greatness or largeness of soul and mind, which excludes forever narrow dogmatism and intolerance of view and ways of life. An attribute of God, not often found, in explicit statement at least, in the theologies is *magnanimity*—the quality of being above petty feeling and small-mindedness. Great-mindedness characterizes the truly philosophical thinker. When he falls into the habit of announcing as absolute truth his views upon the obscure and difficult problems of life, he falls from his estate. Philosophy means the end of cocksureness and petty dogmatism. In its stead one achieves a wide, conscientious tolerance, which is not indifference but nevertheless far removed from bigotry.

“FINDING A NEW RELIGION AND LOSING ONE’S SOUL”

THE facility with which “new religions are summoned from the vastly deep by academicians,” as the Editor of *The Atlantic*, in the March number, phrases it, is suggestively treated by William L. Sullivan in the same issue in an article entitled “Our Spiritual Destitution.”

No more wholesome and spiritually hygienic word has been written in this time of psychological ill health. A layman dares to give a needed lecture to the academicians who are “more formidable to offer suggestions to than a synod of theologians.” For the latter we have souls to save; for the “doctors of the chair” we have no souls but only “raw minds

to instruct." The clear-minded analysis and acute humor with which the case is presented is a rare intellectual treat. As to the daring of a layman in seeking to instruct the doctors instead of submissively asking instruction from them he writes:

For one thing, if these eminent men, by the administering of whatever oxygen the laboratory holds, succeed in making their religion live, it is we who shall have to practise it. Surely, then, it is not unreasonable that we should have something to say about it.

And he reminds them that those for whom religions are devised have needs not encountered in the cloister; that though they may not know so much history, they experience more of it; that they are not the x's, y's, and z's of the formulas of the schools; nor are they the abstractions with which "thinkers have traffic in the respectable witchcraft that is so often called scholarship"; nor yet "the mournful ghosts that haunt the museum of philosophical or psychological hypotheses, that unsung sanctuary of the ever so dead." He reminds them that "We are, in immortal phrase, the people," in a word, "we are homespun human nature, the thing precisely which has sustained so many religions and wrecked so many philosophies. For the religions understood it, the wrecked philosophies did not."

If some resentment appears in the article it is a manifestation of deep religious feeling which bodes well, and suggests a spiritual vigor that is hopeful. The author offers two instances of religious reconstruction presented by scholarly men. In the first of these the essential point is: "First of all, there must be no evasion: *God must go*." In the second the question is why people suffer in surrendering God; learned professors have done so and do not suffer. There are other satisfactions for such as suffer, and these satisfactions are to be found in the sciences.

In these suggestions the author feels that all the splendor of the religious appeal is missing, the magnificence and glory of it are lost, and the proposals fail to release the full energy

of the soul which religion sets free. And he asks a fair question when he inquires: "If grandeur is to be given up, is it too much to ask that it be given up, if not with sorrow, then at least with candor?" He cannot avoid the feeling that in surrendering magnificence, with what he feels is levity, some are surrendering something they have never known; and that the first effect of a denial of God is the loss of the sense of humor.

The ethical defect he finds in the "new religions," or substitutes for it, is that they ignore man "as having an inner life, a moral will, an aspiration and a responsibility to a Right that holds him answerable." This is the serious challenge, for it relates to a deep-seated infection in education, literature, morals, and religion. The confusion and bewilderment in all these phases of life are matters of common remark, and he hesitates to suggest cause or cure. "Still one is impelled to do something even though he will be damned for doing it," and he offers this:

that we have nowhere an adequate teacher of man's inner life as primarily a moral will, as austere in its responsibility as it is in its aspiration. A moral will implies that, even more important than a universe of matter, given with its binding laws to the mind, is *a universe of Right*.

He concludes an all-engaging argument by the suggestion that this is not a propitious time in which to expect a new religion which should be beautiful and rich; for our thought is yet too thin, our culture too jaunty, our psychological and philosophical theories too bent on thinking man away rather than thinking him out. "We give the universe to the intellect; we dare not give it to the soul"; and "It will require a moral will at the utmost of its resolution to do what has got to be done if the soul of America is not to be lost."

WORSHIP AND RELIGION

Is worship the cure-all for the ills of Protestantism? These ills are bad enough, but one begins to weary of the vogue of

damning Protestantism. There is some room for thinking that Romanism may have cause for complaint, but its priests appear to have better sense than to advertise it for so much a column in the magazines, and discredit their faith by wailing about its decline. Moreover Romanism profits, in other ways, by the disposition to accept the compliments to its success by Protestant leaders who accredit it in order to disparage their churches.

Frederick K. Stamm, in the March *Forum*, seems to belong to this group of Protestants only long enough to answer the above question and give it significance. With no intent to belittle the necessity of worship, he answers the question with vigor as follows:

To imagine that a flustered, drowning Protestantism can save itself by clutching at the straw of ritual, liturgy, and symbolism, is pure nonsense. If we want to determine the cause of Protestantism's ills we must resort to something more drastic than the mere restoration of a more ornate worship.

Ritual is the refuge of a declining faith. The worship of the Roman Church is of a piece with its genius; and the same order in the Protestant Churches would be out of harmony with its origin and spirit. Competition here would be fatal. For them a religion of the Spirit is the only, as it was their earliest, dynamic. For this it was born—to "interest men in the mystery and mastery of life." The fault in Protestantism, if fault we must find, is the substitution of an infallible book for an infallible church.

"But what good is an infallible Bible in the hands of fallible interpreters. The idea of an infallible book and a fallible interpreter cannot be split in two parts."

If Protestantism is to be the distinctive force it should be in establishing the ideals of Jesus, "it must keep the teaching of Jesus from being lost in a maze of ritualism and superstition." Indeed we may use everything at our disposal to aid the worshiper to find God. But "let us not get the cart before the horse." Unless religion enters the soul as a mysterious some-

thing to whiten it and lift up everything, all the outward aids will be but superstitious substitutes. When this mystery of reality is in a man the beauties of nature, the artist's work, the sculptor's tool will all be for him a way to find God.

It is for Protestantism to say whether the Sermon on the Mount and Jesus' outdoor method of bringing men face to face with God shall take precedence over an elaborate method of worship, etc.

Such forms of worship *may* help men to find God who already know the way; but the finding of God, we may add, which makes him a principle and law in the life is to find him within the mind and soul, when he finds them in the holy of holies of their life.

Again Doctor Stamm urges, "Protestantism must not fear to give a scientific interpretation of religion."

There is a suspicion that she does fear it. Many of her ministers believe in it in their private thinking. We all recognize this as a plea for candor and both open speech and open minds. For the Protestant Churches "the ritual must be the ritual of doing good; and seeking the truth in all things must be the watchword."

But the greatest need in these Churches is "the ability to quicken in the human heart a sense of sin and the necessity of an experience with God." They need the kind of religion "that stands up and looks the natural man in the eye and tells him he is damned because of his sin."

Doctor Stamm seems to wander when he insists that "Protestantism has no redeeming God" and that Jesus was a nice, benign being whom an angry God put to death as a sacrifice for the sins of humanity. He seems more nearly in the right way when he notices that a large element thinks it is religious when it doggedly defends all the doctrines and asks people if they have "got religion."

For Jesus, religion was a power within that would test itself against the world, and Paul would think, we remember, that

“the gospel is the power of God unto salvation.” Power to help, better to *enable* us to do what we know we ought to do, and that power the grace of God—that is religion.

Worship, of whatever sort, which will help us to this power to live in the loyalty of God, that worship is indeed good and right. But worship, no matter what its complexity and symbolism, or its simplicity and formalism, which is offered in the name of God as a substitute for a real experience with God as the power for a right life—this is an abomination and a deceit.

WHAT'S WHAT IN THE MAGAZINES

ALL students and leaders in religion who are interested in affecting a unionism of Protestantism, and who may find evidences tending toward that consummation, might read with profit a recent article entitled "Catholic Protestantism"¹ by Professor John T. McNeill of the University of Chicago. For some time Doctor McNeill has made a thorough study of the Reformation from the standpoint of the ideals actuating the various leaders, especially as they pertained to the restoration of the true Catholic Church which, the Reformers believed, the Church of Rome had corrupted, if not denied. Some conclusions from his investigations have been published in two other articles² in addition to that mentioned above.

Doctor McNeill finds this catholicity among the early Protestant Reformers. Luther, for example, championed the right to the name of Christian or Church of such groups as the Greeks and the Hussites, who, refusing the "Roman Obedience," were condemned by that church as "schismatics" and "heretics." And it was this "narrowness of Rome's alleged catholicity that antagonized Luther." Melanchthon was in full accord with Luther and was, perhaps, even more intense in his desire to realize "the corporate unity of the Catholic Church." In Zwingli is to be found a similar conception of the church as "the whole body of the believers of which Christ is the Head and Ruler." This may be said to be true especially of Calvin who made the church central in his scheme of things. To him schism was so great an evil that he could declare that "revolt from the church is denial of God himself." And defending Protestantism from this charge by Rome he was will-

¹ *The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought*. Toronto, November-December, 1928, p. 449.

² Calvin's Efforts toward the Consolidation of Protestantism, and Cranmer's Project for a Reformed Consensus, in the *Journal of Religion*, July and October, respectively, 1928.

ing to admit that, if Rome was not herself a church, there were churches within her.

This consciousness of and desire for unity, Professor McNeill finds also in the many Protestant Confessions, from that of Augsburg (1530) to the Westminster (1647). So, he states, "the Reformation was a revolt, not against the principle of unity and catholicity, but against the privileged and oppressive monarchy of Rome—an uprising not merely of national, but of Catholic feeling, against what had become a localized and overcentralized imperialism in Christianity, which made true catholicity impossible." Their failure in obtaining the "recovery and promotion of catholicity in Christianity" was due "partly through their own faults, partly through the faults of others, and partly through circumstances beyond all human control. . ."

R. E. E. HARKNESS

THE question of character-training has now come to the fore in earnest in liberal school circles. The subject receives special attention in practically every conference and journal under educational auspices. Experiments are in process in many institutions of learning having in mind the study of the social and moral development of the individual. In the January number of *Religious Education* is a symposium on "Character Education in Perspective," materials arranged in harmony with the Religious Education Association's convention theme in March. These articles provide an historic perspective of character education in Christianity and an analysis of the present-day situation in church, home, and public school. Early Church, Catholic, Reformed, and Evangelical Protestant views are presented. Seminary instructors in departments of Old Testament, New Testament, Church History, and Religious Education, as well as secular schoolmen, contribute to the survey. Within this brief compass the reader will find a rewarding analysis of religious traditions, social problems, and

educational ideals in terms of the most significant movement in current school procedure.

THE missionary gospel of divine *assurance*, which its bearers carried to the Orient a hundred years ago, has become the *problem* in present-day religious endeavor, according to Professor A. G. Baker in an article "Jesus Christ as Interpreted by the Missionary Enterprise," in the *Journal of Religion*, January, 1929, pp. 1-11. The leaders of the church who took counsel at the recent Jerusalem Council discovered this fact when they undertook to define the Christian religion. Doctor Baker analyzes the Council's answer in terms of an accommodative supernaturalism, points out its "very ineffectual appeal to those who are caught up in this new social mind, which we shall call naturalism," and proceeds to construct a view of Christocentric faith which does justice to the facts of this scientific age without suffering the loss of an evangelical fervor.

The writer recognizes Jesus for his own true worth as "the originator and the center" of the religious movement that became Christianity, but he also notes that the Christ who exists today is "an idea and an ideal in the hearts of his people, an ideal which is incarnated in human lives in the form of virtuous habits and self-sacrificing service. . ." It is this figure of faith rather than an ethereal person that saves men today. The church should proceed boldly to conceive a new Christology answering to the needs of this scientific age, and thus continue its testimony unimpaired and appeal to people who desire to be Christian, while they cultivate their minds in the latest methods of search for truth.

ALTHOUGH Professor M. C. Otto agrees with Carl Sandburg that man "came from the wilderness," he insists that, since time has not only a past dimension but a present and future ones, there is another stage in the inquiry "What is

Man?" (*International Journal of Ethics*, January, 1929, pp. 190-204). The psychopathologist who desires to define human nature solely in terms of its animal origins is basing his theory on insufficient evidence. Man is understood as he is witnessed in his primitive *and* developed forms. Animal and human psychology are not rigidly separated, though man has attained a controlling place in cosmic drama which is unique in animate creation. To witness the panorama of events and conquests that have brought this biped from "the wilderness" to modern city design is to recognize one bent upon becoming "master of the planet for ages to come."

The writer escapes absolute ethical idealism in his purview. Although he recognizes "moral gain" in the long human procession, he observes periods of deviation from the better way of life. We are caught in such an arrest today. Religion and morals require restatement to meet the demands of expanding life interests. What of tomorrow? The age-old struggle within the soul between conformity to the group and the assertion of free individuality calls for happier resolution for the masses of mankind. The immense structure of industry has overcome such traditional ideals as are expressed in law and religion and has become "the dominant force in contemporary affairs." Men are faced with the necessity of reversing means and ends in their pattern of living. Life must become of more import than things. The stirring discontent in many human breasts toward this situation gives Professor Otto hope that men will labor to bring forth a philosophy of life adequate to make material and mechanical culture subordinate to moral and spiritual principles and permit the race of men to move on in its high adventure.

STEWART G. COLE.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Background of the Bible: A Handbook of Biblical Introduction. HENRY KENDALL BOOTH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.00.

THIS is a good book, and no doubt will be a great help to many readers. It is an excellent sign of the times, in that it comes from the pen of a preacher-pastor. As such it is scholarly. The fact that such a book can be written by one who is face to face with the daily grind and routine of an active ministry, augurs well for the future. It is an indication that the results of scholarship are now being generally accepted. Happy will be the day when it can no longer be said that in theological thinking our church people are forty years behind those of England and Scotland. Such contributions as this will help to that end.

A very wide range of topics, all related to the Biblical field, is covered in these two hundred and eighty pages. From the work of the spade to the American revised version, from the rudiments of art of twenty-five thousand years ago to the evaluation of the literary quality of our translations, from Osiris worship to a devout reverence for Jesus, our author has amassed a wealth of historical material such as has rarely if ever been attempted in one volume. So numerous and so varied are the topics of information that it would be quite impossible even to suggest the themes embraced in the volume. Yet it is much more than a mere background of the Bible, as the title might suggest. It is in fact a moral and spiritual evaluation of the worthfulness of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. As such it is sane and worthy. Withal it is readable. Even the uninitiated must be carried along chapter after chapter by the enthusiasm of the author who feels the throb of romance whether he is indicating the resurrection of buried civilizations or following the evolution of the Prophet.

Yet the volume is so good and will be so helpful that one could wish it were better. In these days none but the expert can keep abreast of the vital contributions that are being made in the field of Biblical scholarship. The unqualified phrase, the too ready acceptance of a new theory, or the evident lack of information of recent discoveries, betray the hand of the man whose chief work is the ministry of religion. Perhaps Tel en-Nesbeh is the ancient Mizpeh (p. 8). It may be open to question whether Jehovah was worshiped in Palestine in the pre-Mosaic period (p. 88). A student of comparative religion would scarcely agree that "the Bible is unique among the sacred books of the world's religions in the fact that it

came out of real life and was born out of actual history" (p. 1). Not many would agree that fifty thousand Jews returned with Ezra and Nehemiah (p. 135). And when the author who refuses to perpetuate the blunder of the silent centuries, four hundred years preceding the birth of Jesus, states that the Old Testament closed with the return of Ezra and his fellow exiles to Palestine, and ignores the abundance of literature of this period found in the Old Testament itself, as Isaiah 24 to 27, Proverbs 30:1-9; Esther, Daniel, as well as other important sections, he surely has for the moment forgotten some of his earlier conclusions. Also the bibliography belonging to each chapter, while showing wide reading, is often out of date, and sometimes a quite inferior book finds its way into the list. Yet not only can we heartily recommend the book, but do hope that there may soon be a demand for a second and perhaps a better edition.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

Greek Thought in the New Testament. GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1928. Pp. 216. \$1.75.

FEW men have done more to make available to readers of the New Testament the results of critical study than the veteran scholar, Doctor Gilbert. Thousands have read with deep appreciation his volumes, *Jesus, The Student's Life of Paul, The Student's Life of Jesus, Jesus and His Bible*. Now Doctor Gilbert turns his attention to disentangling the gospel of Jesus from the interpretations and speculations, primarily Greek, with which it soon became intertwined.

After sketching in able fashion the inroads that Greek thought after Alexander made in the thinking of the Jews before the time of Christ and the Greek environment in which the Apostolic Church found itself, he turns to the various parts of the New Testament, the writings of Paul, the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, the Petrine letters, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Johannean Writings (I John and the Fourth Gospel), and finds in them much that was alien to Jesus and his teaching.

To cite but a few examples: Paul's whole theory of the nature of Christ and of his relation to God and the universe comes from the thought world, not of Palestine but of Alexandria with its speculation and in particular from the conception of the Logos popularized by Philo. Or again in the matter of the sacraments. At the beginning of the second century the Church was thoroughly sacramental. This is a far note from the teaching of Jesus. Accordingly, although Doctor Gilbert perhaps errs on the side of caution, he yet maintains that though we are to conclude that Paul did not hold definitely sacramental views regarding the rites, yet

they were to him far more than symbols, and that if the later Church had any New Testament sponsor for its sacramentalism it was Paul.

The story of supernatural birth of Jesus is the most radical and far-reaching invasion of Greek thought into the synoptic tradition, but it does not stand alone. The story of the rending of the veil of the temple is plainly a piece of allegory, and since the allegorical element in the New Testament in Doctor Gilbert's eyes is distinctly Greek, hence this incident as well as the "crude allegory" of the stater in the fish's mouth is Greek. The story of Peter walking on the water is not only allegorical but "more akin to pagan magic than to Jesus' works of mercy."

The Epistle to the Hebrews which is almost entirely Greek is deeply indebted to Philo and Plato and the views of the Logos and of Ideas. In the Fourth Gospel the same phenomenon is to be found. The prologue in which Jesus is identified as the Logos is by no means a preface but is vitally connected with the body of the book, for Jesus himself is made to teach what is there said about him. In his discourse with Nicodemus he appeals to what he has "seen" and "heard" with the Father, and can tell Nicodemus about "heavenly things" because he himself has "descended out of heaven."

Probably few will disagree with the author's contention that the New Testament writings are shot through and through with Greek thought, although there will probably be a difference of opinion at times as to where the line is to be drawn. The chief ground for disagreement will perhaps be in his view that these later accretions and modifications seriously mar the original beauty and power of the Gospel of Jesus. He makes a half-hearted denial in the concluding chapter, saying, that it is not his purpose to speak of the truth and value of the Greek element in the New Testament, but one can hardly fail to feel a decided undercurrent of distaste for it. Christianity for him consists in the authentic teachings of Jesus, not in the religion about him which triumphed in the Gentile world. With the view that modifications and adaptations were necessary if the gospel were to take root in alien soil he finds himself opposed. "But who is wise enough to say what the simple religion of Jesus could or could not have accomplished in the Gentile world in Paul's century or in the second or third if it had been proclaimed in its simplicity and in the spirit of Jesus?" or again, "Is it not a plain surrender of the Gospel of Jesus, as well as a clear denial of world-wide Christian experience, to say that the Pauline transformation of the gospel was necessary to its triumph in the Gentile world?" So to Doctor Gilbert "it appears to be radically unjustifiable to claim for the element of Greek thought in the New Testament either that it became Christian because it was adopted by Christians, or

that it was necessary to the success of the religion of Jesus among the Greeks."

Perhaps he is right, but many doubts and questions arise. This whole "back to Jesus movement" is fraught with the real peril of cutting the vital nerve of religion by removing the personal contributions of the individual worshipers. Is it possible to worship in any real sense a God whom we have not ourselves endowed with our own unfulfilled longings and aspirations?

Another difficulty occurs. It would appear from this study of Doctor Gilbert's that he felt that all one need to do was to dissolve the Greek element of the Gospels away and that the original Jesus would be left in pristine purity. Is this not too optimistic? After we have removed this layer of accretion will we not find—rather have we not already found—that still more swathings must be undone, and that the hope of ever finding him uninterpreted, unchanged, is doomed to endless disappointment?

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, Including the Apocrypha. Edited by CHARLES GORE, HENRY LEIGHTON GOUDGE, and ALFRED GUILLAUME. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1928. Pp. xvi, 697, 158, 743. \$5.00.

A GROUP of over fifty Anglican scholars under the direction of Bishop Gore has produced a one-volume Bible Commentary and Dictionary. The fact that all contributors must of necessity be members of the Anglican communion limited the list of available scholars; yet within this limit an effort, and a successful one, was made to secure specialists for the several parts.

Each book of the Old and New Testaments and Old Testament Apocrypha is provided with a brief critical introduction, giving in condensed form the necessary information for an understanding of the book, and a commentary. By necessity the commentaries are extremely brief. Instead of a discussion word by word or verse by verse short blocks of the text are discussed.

In addition to the commentary proper are numerous essays on related subjects, such as: "The Bible in the Church," "The Function of Literary and Historical Criticism," "Introduction to the Criticism of the Pentateuch," "A Comparative Study of the Old Testament," "Environment Social, Political, Intellectual, and Religious of Israel from Maccabees to our Lord," "The Political, Religious, and Gentile Backgrounds of Early Christianity," "The Synoptic Problem," "The Teaching and Outline of the Life of Jesus," "The Evidences of the Resurrection," "The Virgin

Birth," "The Theology of Paul," "The Textual Criticism of the New Testament," etc.

The tone of the whole book is that of a moderate liberalism. The several authors are quite aware of the critical problems at issue, but have succeeded in producing a book that should not seriously shock any intelligent reader. The effort has been throughout to produce a work that should be of service to ministers in that "daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures to which they are pledged." In spite of the obvious desire to serve Anglican ministers it should prove of real service to those of other communions as well, and to those especially whose theological library must of necessity be limited. The volume is interesting and readable, and the amount of information to be found is truly amazing. The reader who digests this book should have a very good working knowledge of the Bible.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

How One Man Changed the World. A Story Told for Boys and Girls.

FERDINAND Q. BLANCHARD. Boston and Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. 1928. Pp. 130. \$1.50.

THIS charming little volume by the pastor of the Euclid Avenue Congregational Church of Cleveland, Ohio, himself a father, will bring to many a perplexed minister and parent a source of joy. What shall I tell my child about Jesus? How can I make him real? These problems were the problems too of Doctor Blanchard. He says: "It was because I found children likely to begin speaking of Jesus with some theological statement which they had been taught, but whose meaning they did not at all grasp, and because their knowledge seemed too often to end with this same inadequately understood statement, that I have desired to make him seem as real a personality as Abraham Lincoln, or as Jesus himself seems when one walks over the very hills he climbed and stands by the lake beside which he spoke his truth."

Nothing of the sweetly sentimental nor of the mawkish so often found in Lives of Jesus designed for children is found in these pages. From beginning to end it is a beautiful and lovely idyll. Happy indeed are all children who are privileged to meet Jesus in this way. A friendship so begun can hardly fail to ripen as the years pass, and better yet the friendship will suffer no disillusionments.

A deep and real scholarship, always present but never apparent, a remarkable ability to be clear without talking down, a chaste yet vigorous diction—all these and more contribute to this truly remarkable book, which can hardly fail to fill a niche long vacant.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

The Itinerary of Jesus Reviewed. ALBERT L. VAIL. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1928. Pp. 48.

THE author revises the order of the early incidents of Jesus' ministry "first, to vindicate Luke as historian, and second, to reveal Jesus more perfectly as the perfect man, intellectually and spiritually, psychologically and practically, in harmony with his deity acting within its self-appointed limitations" (p. 9). Marked success in so ambitious a task perhaps should not be expected.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

Protestantism in the United States. ARCHER B. BASS. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1929. \$3.00.

AMERICA has been considered the land of sectarianism. Annual church reports and the United States census have made us aware of the divisions and subdivisions within our larger denominations as well as of the minor sects that are within our national boundaries. There has been a tendency on the part of some students to account for these by factors of peculiar American quality—political and religious freedom, separation of Church and State, free lands, opportunities for segregation and isolation, problems arising in the rapid settlement of country and city.

Mr. Bass, however, brings statistics which give a slightly different view of the causes. Many of these groups, he calls to our attention, had their origins across the sea and have been imported into this country. Thus from 1607 unto the present there have been 42 groups imported, whereas 112 are native. Moreover, of these latter, the appearance of many is due to old country factors coming into conflict with the new as in the case, for instance, of race and language.

The author recognizes the effect of the frontier and of the "politico-religious theories" as causal forces in these sectarian divisions, but lays greater stress upon "aspects of theological belief, theories of church polity, and sociological ideas." It is in the making of this point, however, that the author reveals the real weakness of his book for it would seem that, in America as elsewhere, it is always the social-political-economic-religious order that gives rise to theologies and views of ecclesiastical systems.

The second part of the book (Chap. VI-XI) under the title, "Interdenominationalism in the United States; its Problems and Progress," is an exceptionally fine piece of informing, prophetic work. An immense collection of statistics is presented in dealing with such questions as "Cooperation and the Distribution of Denominations among the States"; "Cooperation and Home Missions"; "Cooperation and Foreign Mis-

sions," and "Training for Cooperation." In these chapters and others the religious situation of our country is frankly presented—with neither undue pessimism or optimism—the problems and difficulties outlined and suggestions offered for solutions and remedies. In "Cooperation and the United States" as in "Additional Movements toward Cooperation," some of the measures now being followed to escape the evils of overlapping and over-churching are reviewed.

Some weaknesses in this otherwise excellent work must be mentioned. One feels that the author too often makes use of magazine articles for his statements rather than the minutes or other reports of associations or conventions of religious bodies. Too much reliance at times may have been placed upon the glowing accounts of certain "union efforts" rather than upon the actual achievement.

There is also a laxity in the use of terms or the making of statements that detracts from a complete reliability upon the work as a whole. "Anabaptists and Baptists . . . admitted only those believers who had been immersed" (p. 38). "The Anabaptists, Baptists, and Mennonites contended that believers only should be baptized. The mode of baptism was by sprinkling or pouring, until around 1640 the Particular Baptists began to use immersion . . ." (p. 40). Did Anabaptists and Mennonites then become immersionists? " . . . in the Declaration and Address proposed by Thomas Campbell and concurred in by his "father" (son), Alexander Campbell . . . (p. 55). The Methodist Episcopal Church is listed as one arising in this country under the leadership of Philip "Embry" (Embury) while the Baptists are among those arising in the old country, "since they were organized among the comers to this country, and especially, were led by ministers trained elsewhere." But Embury and Barbara Heck came from Ireland with a group of other Wesleyans who as such organized their church in New York 1766-67.

Such mistakes and inconsistencies as these and others that may have been mentioned, tend to raise doubts as to the trustworthiness of all statistics quoted and statements made. The book, however, is a very timely and helpful contribution in the study of American Protestantism.

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

Tongues of Fire. GRACE H. TURNBULL. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 416. \$3.50.

IN this day of intense intellectual interest in religion—of the so-called conflict of science and religion and the innumerable efforts to define religion—Miss Turnbull has done the sane and serviceable thing. She

has begun at the beginning. She has brought together some religious expressions of the race as uttered in that ancient Egypt of marvelous splendor, in age-old mystic India, in slumbering, half-forgotten China, in Persia, cradle of culture, in intellectual Greece, and in Arabia of the caravan trade-routes. Here is religion in varied form, it is true; in phrases that may seem strange the one to the other—yet one in that common, unending quest of man to achieve the mastery in this life's struggle and thereby find peace and deepest satisfaction.

How can one define religion—this human attribute—who knows but one religion and that in the one phase only of its Western, modern manifestation? Is that sufficient? Would any one be considered an authority in botany who had studied but one specimen of one botanical species?

Miss Turnbull has given an anthology of religion which any layman may read with delight and profit. The compilation includes "early conceptions of the genesis of the world"; teachings from the "books of wisdom"; psalms and hymns; prayers; ethical and spiritual teachings of the great religious leaders; discourses of the religious philosophers—all of which are a very real help in our effort to understand man religiously.

The book is, as the subtitle indicates, "A Bible composed of sacred scriptures of the pagan world."

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

Europe: A History of Ten Years. RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1928. Price, \$2.50.

THIS is one of the best, most instructive studies of conditions and developments in Europe during the past decade that has yet appeared. The author gives us first the Europe of war and of its hysteria at the time of the Versailles Conference at which Germany was treated as an outcast among the nations, forced to bear the sins of the world. With the inevitable breakdown of some of the provisions of this treaty, France demanded safeguards and securities which lost for her some of the good-will and sympathy of other portions of mankind.

From that time there appeared in the various nations a changing attitude toward Germany and the requirements laid upon her in the Versailles treaty, which resulted in the appointment of the Reparation Commission and its recommendations as embodied in the so-called Dawes-Plan. Out of that conciliatory agreement grew Locarno with its declaration that "war of aggression is an international crime," its treaties guaranteeing the inviolability of frontiers between continental nations and its opening of the doors of the Council of the League of Nations to Germany.

"The 'spirit of Locarno' was symbolic of the chastened spirit which had descended upon Europe; the spirit of Versailles was nearly dead."

Mr. Buell in the remaining chapters of his book gives a résumé of the social, economic, and political conditions in the principal states of Europe—reconstruction in France; the gigantic burdens carried by the peoples of the British Isles (Is England Done?); internal affairs of Germany; dangers in the Balkans and Soviet Russia—and the hopes reposed in them also. In a final chapter he treats of The Prospects for Peace, in which there are reviewed the many factors that affect the achievement of that desired end—racial heritages, economic differences, personal and class ambitions, questions of reparations and debts, but also recent treaties, memories, and burdens of the last war, the League of Nations and the World Court.

It is a book greatly worth reading, giving, in unbiased and splendidly written form, an insight into the economic and political complexities that control governments, yet also sure evidence that they do constantly seek world peace. Europe has had not only a political but a spiritual revival as well.

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

The Kingdom in the States. FRANK W. PADELFORD, Executive Secretary of the Board of Education Northern Baptist Convention. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1928. Cloth, \$1.00; paper, 60 cents.

In this little book of near two hundred pages, Doctor Padelford has given clearly and concisely the story of the organization, activities, and problems of the Baptist Conventions in the various States of the Northern Baptist Convention. Naturally it is not exhaustive, yet the book brings to the hand of any one interested all the facts that are essential.

Beginning with the pioneers he tells the story of the early Baptists in the Eastern States; how their Missionary Societies grew into the State Conventions and their influence spread Westward. Then follows a treatment of the present problems—the unprecedented growth of American cities; the difficulties in the rural sections due in some measure to the deflation in the price of land and of agricultural products as well as to the tenant system. Yet new agencies to meet these needs are being developed under the direction of State secretaries: united parishes, district ministers, religious education programs, daily vacation Bible schools, community churches—a survey that reveals the initiative, executive ability, and sacrifice of many of these men.

The present demands and tasks, both in the great cities, growing by the thousands each year, and in the vast Western States with not yet a

one-hundredth of their possible population, are finally set forth. This constitutes a challenge, not only to the student with his ideal of service, but also to the Christian layman with his sense of stewardship.

It is a book that may be used with great profit in the study classes or mid-week meeting of any and all of the Baptist churches.

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

New Horizons of the Christian Faith. The Hale Lectures, 1927-28. FREDERICK C. GRANT, S. T. D., Dean of the Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Company. 1928.

THE book is one more contribution to the already voluminous discussion of the relationship of science and religion. In one respect it adds a new note to that controversy. Doctor Grant makes it clear that so far as the Bible is concerned the conflict is not so much between science and the religious spirit of that book as it is between certain views of present-day natural science and those of a pre-scientific age, which have been associated with religious conceptions simply because they are to be found in the Bible. The creation stories of the Book of Genesis, he tells us, are not in themselves religious. One may hold them or reject them and still be a good Jew or Christian. The religious element in them is that God created and that for a moral purpose.

But it is when Doctor Grant seeks to harmonize present-day science with his own definition of religion and his theology that his argument proves fruitless. For him religion is a dependence upon a Supreme Being. A study of "the History of Religions" reveals, he declares, that, "the beginnings of religion are traceable to the root feeling of reverence, or awe, the response to 'awareness of God.'" Without caring to question in this review the validity of this conclusion, the author's attempt to identify this God with the "primitive properties" or the "world-stuff," the electro-energy of the scientist, must be questioned.

This, as Prof. G. B. Smith has shown in "An Overlooked Factor in the Adjustment between Religion and Science" (*Journal of Religion*, July, 1927) is the fallacy into which the theologian falls who is sympathetic toward science and yet clings to his theory of revelation. But the substance with which science deals is not "God." It is still material, physical, and not spirit, however similar they may seem in "essence" because unseen. That "continuity of process" of the scientist has not the attributes of the Christian God whatever may be the theologian's rationalization concerning it.

We must learn that the concept God is a religious product. And

when shall we learn the truth of the old epigram: "God cannot be discovered at the end of a syllogism" ?

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

Taking the Name of Science in Vain. HORACE JAMES BRIDGES. New York: The Macmillan Company. Pp. 273.

THE science that Mr. Bridges has especially in mind, is psychology, and the particular sort of psychology that he finds reprehensible is the behaviorism of Prof. John B. Watson, and his popularizers, like H. L. Mencken and Clarence Darrow. His refutation of behaviorism, and of the mechanistic philosophy of which it is a part, is not only a specimen of delightfully clever writing, but absolutely convincing and itself irrefutable. For he takes the unanswerable ground that, in their attempt to prove that there is no such thing as self-consciousness, personality, freedom, responsibility, behaviorists are compelled at every step to assume the existence of that which they deny. If, for example, the man whom we call a criminal cannot be and do other than what he is and does, the same is true of the rest of us; so why call on us to pity what we cannot pity and to treat the criminal mildly when we can do no other than punish him severely? If man is a machine only, then he can have no rights, or if he has all other machines have the same. In short, behaviorism is howling nonsense, and to state it intelligibly without self-contradiction is impossible. Mr. Bridges does good service in pointing this out, and reestablishing on a firm basis personality and all its implications. His chapter on "Rationality, Liberty and License in Literature and Art" is especially excellent, and hardly inferior is that on "Civic Rights and Duties."

Some of the author's *obiter dicta* are curiously out of harmony with his main ideas. Here is one sample:

The taking of narcotic drugs which ruin health and undermine character is, I think, a thing that society may justly prohibit; for here no rational and healthy use is possible. The thing itself is an abuse. Not so, however, with alcoholic beverages. Of these there is a proper, civilized, rational use, and the law cannot justly prohibit this in order to prevent their abuse.

So intelligent a man and so acute a thinker as Mr. Bridges in general shows himself to be should not permit himself such sophistry. He should know the verdict of science, that alcohol is one of the narcotic poisons that he admits may be legitimately prohibited by society because of their experienced effects. He must know that there is no narcotic that has done more than alcohol to "ruin health and undermine character." As he says, "the thing itself is an abuse," for alcohol is always a harmful beverage—it is merely a question of less or more. Nor does society infringe on

individual rights by prohibiting alcohol as a beverage, for there are not and never have been any "individual rights" save those that society grants, guarantees, and protects.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Jesus the Man and Christ the Spirit. GEORGE COULSON WORKMAN, M. A., Ph. D.
New York: The Macmillan Company. 1928. Pp. 343.

ALREADY favorably known in theological circles by his book on *At Onement, or Reconciliation with God*, and other writings, Doctor Workman will find many readers well disposed toward this volume. It is important to get his point of view at the outset. He is no iconoclast, but a constructive thinker, attempting the task of making the ancient Christian faith appear rational to a modern. He deals in negatives only so far as any proposition involves denial of that which is its logical contradictory. This is how he conceives himself and his book.

Consequently, it is never polemic, though often argumentative. Its spirit is fine. Whether we accept all the author's conclusions, or a part of them, or none of them, with him personally no reader has cause to quarrel. The one fault that can be found with his manner of presentation is an occasional cocksure dogmatism, as when in his Preface he says:

Historical exegesis makes it possible to prove that the accounts of the virgin birth of Jesus are traditional, that his oneness with the Father was ethical, that his resurrection from the dead was spiritual, that his state of pre-existence was impersonal and that his place in the Trinity is experimental (p. 11).

If Doctor Workman had been content to say that the exegesis of one school of exegetes makes these things probable, instead of "proving" them, his assertion would probably have passed unquestioned.

The antithesis expressed in the title of the book accurately suggests its main idea, and the distinction thus indicated is perhaps as clearly defined in this brief paragraph as anywhere in the book:

A person walks, a spirit works; a person speaks, a spirit operates; a person is an entity, but a spirit is an energy. As a person, Jesus instructed his followers; as a spirit he energizes them. As a person he stimulated their minds; as a spirit he quickens their hearts. As a person, he impressed all who listened to him; as a spirit, he possesses all who will receive him (p. 24).

This seems to make personality inseparable from bodily form, and the author nowhere makes it clear whether he believes that Jesus in his present spirit life possesses self-consciousness, intelligence, and power of self-direction. It seems most probable, from all that he says and does not say, that Doctor Workman regards Jesus, and indeed God himself, as spirit, in the sense of "energy," but with none of the other qualities of

human personality. If this conclusion does Doctor Workman any wrong, he is himself at fault for not making his meaning clearer.

Jesus was a man, with a nature like ours, divine as all men are divine, but to a unique degree, because he was "filled unto all the fulness of God," and free from sin because he would not yield to temptation. But his experiences were no different in kind from ours, and when we have fellowship with the Father and his Son, we not only partake of the divine nature but participate in the divine life, as Jesus did.

Of the incarnation, Doctor Workman says, that in God which creates, reveals, illumines, became a human being. Jesus was not the God-man but the God-filled man. God incarnated himself in Jesus uniquely, by taking full possession of him, but he incarnates himself in all men who will receive his spirit. As to the resurrection, it was not bodily and "we do not know what became of the body of Jesus after it was placed in the tomb" (p. 164), but the "thing of consequence to us is that the apostles obtained evidence that his spirit was alive, and that its life-giving power might be experienced by all who would receive it" (p. 166).

We further gather these as important ideas of the author: The Sonship of Christ is official and impersonal. His Christship consists in his expressing something fundamental in the character of God, redemptive love. His Saviourship consists in the fact that God accomplishes his purpose of redemption through his agency. "God saves those who unite themselves to him in Christ, and he cannot save them consciously or completely in any other way" (p. 256). "The Christ-spirit is sufficient to regenerate all individuals, to reconstruct all communities, to reconstitute all nations or states, and to reorganize the world" (p. 313).

From all of which any one may safely conclude that here is a book that will amply repay a careful and critical reading.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Sacraments: A Study of Some Moments in the Attempt to Define Their Meaning for Christian Worship. A. L. LILLEY, Canon Residentiary, Chancellor and Praelector of Hereford. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 159.

If the reader grants the initial premise, that sacraments are not only symbols of divine grace, but means by which that grace is effectually conveyed to recipients, he will find little in this book to which he can object. The author's attempt to save sacramental doctrine from materialism and to make it consistent with spirituality, indeed an aid thereto, is praiseworthy. And from his point of view it is tolerably successful. He shows

that a spiritual worship is possible for a sacramentalist, but if he shows that the natural tendency of sacramentalism is not materialistic and unspiritual I have missed his argument.

And he is not quite candid in his last chapter, on Transubstantiation. One seems to read there, between the lines, the desire to minimize the differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and to detect a hope of future reunion of the two. Be that as it may, a candid treatment of the Roman doctrine cannot ignore certain Tridentine canons that no Protestant can admit to be spiritual. "If any one saith that the sacraments . . . do not confer that grace on those who do not place an obstacle thereunto . . . let him be anathema." "If any one saith that by the said sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the act performed (*ex opere operato*) . . . let him be anathema." Our author ignores this authoritative teaching of the Roman Church and by so much invalidates his exposition of Transubstantiation.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

And Was Made Man: An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. LEONARD HODGSON, M. A., Professor of Christian Apologetics in the General Theological Seminary, New York; formerly Fellow and Dean of Divinity of Magdalen College, Oxford. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd. 1928. Pp. 216. \$3.50.

THIS is not an ordinary introduction to the Gospels. It is a philosophical approach as well as literary and historical. The author has no misconceptions about the so-called restoration of the "Jesus of history." He is sure of the actual "humanity" of Jesus, as the title of the book, *And Was Made Man*, indicates. He is equally certain that no Christian can approach the object of faith without some degree of "subjectivity," for "the study of Jesus Christ must inevitably be based upon the religious experiences of the student himself." The author's preface has a paragraph that excites interest.

From time to time the professional student of theology, who knows something of the complexity and difficulty of the problems which lie in the way of arriving at any historical account of Christ, is struck by the vast success achieved by some popular writer who, gaily ignoring these difficulties and the careful, scientific, and often productive study which has been devoted to them, puts forth his impression as "the truth at last." But so long as Christians are nourished in church or Sunday school on unintelligent methods of Bible study, and are not encouraged themselves to grow in wisdom in their religious life, so long they will be a prey to this kind of writing. What I have aimed at in this book is to provide, not a "life of Christ," or any substitute for the study of the Gospels themselves, but an aid to their intelligent study which may help readers to discriminate between what is, and what is not, legitimate interpretation.

The method of procedure is based upon years of experience in teaching both in England and in America. He has discovered the necessity of directing attention to theological and philosophical questions as preliminary to the study of the earliest Christian literature. The result is a thoroughly up-to-date discussion, even though the reader may not assent to all conclusions reached. The contents of the volume are: The Gospels and Christianity; The Nature of the Authority of Christ's Teaching; The Mind of Christ; Eschatology; Rewards and Punishments; Miracles; Outlines of Life; The Fourth Gospel; Epilogue.

The marks of a "Professor of Christian Apologetics" are evident in the treatment of each subject. How successfully he meets the beliefs of "uncritical piety" and the "rationalism which denies the doctrine of the Incarnation because of the thoroughness with which He was made man" must be left to the judgment of the reader. But whatever the judgment may be as to the effectiveness of the apology, he will have found it worth while to discover Professor Hodgson's method of approach to some permanent New Testament problems.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Frankness in Religion. ROBERT J. HUTCHEON, A. M. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 307. \$2.50.

SINCE 1913 Professor Hutcheon has been connected with the Meadville Theological School, Chicago. Before that date he had been minister of the First Unitarian Church in Toronto, Canada. He conceived it to be his duty as minister to his people to interpret the inherited doctrines of Christianity to his hearers. The doctrine of special revelation seemed to him to be in special need of restatement. If Christian beliefs are to have any value in practical life, they must be related to the general cultural life of the present. The essential faith of the Christian religion must be made to seem as congenial to religious people today as to its first creators. This presupposes the acceptance of the results of the method of scientific and philosophical thinking today. Hence, the title of the volume is eminently appropriate. *Frankness in Religion* is an invitation to accompany the perplexed reader in the difficult but open road of "thinking things through."

Of the fifteen chapters several have special value and suggestiveness, viz.: Religion and the Creative Imagination; Conversion as a Stage in Spiritual Evolution; Salvation as the Organization of Character; The Unpredictable as a Substitute for the Miraculous; The Present Values of Worship; The Nature and Values of Faith; and, The Meaning of God in Modern Thought.

To many who need an interpretation of their religious life that shall make it seem an integral part of their total cultural experience, Professor Hutcheon's book will be helpful. He writes for those who are perplexed enough to feel the problems and cannot be "tempted to fall back either into the mists of mysticism and poetry, or into the capacious arms of authority."

MILTON G. EVANS.

The Word of God and the Word of Man. KARL BARTH, D. D. Translated from the German by Douglas Horton. The Pilgrim Press. 1928. Pp. 327. \$2.25.

ENGLISH readers have for some time been aware of a new name in theological thought and the emergence of new "parties" in religious controversy. They have been wondering what "Barthianism" is, and who is the preacher and professor named Karl Barth. They suspect that he is no ordinary person, since hundreds crowd to hear him preach. At least one distinguished historian, Professor Lange, regards him "the greatest theologian since Schleiermacher," earnest evangelists in his native land consider him the "one hope" of Protestantism, and scores of fellow ministers find in him a reinterpretation of Augustine and Calvin that make these titanic fashioners of "the faith" seem at home in the modern world. Their curiosity can now be satisfied through the translation of a series of addresses by Barth, which are said to contain the essence of his message. The translator, Douglas Horton, minister of the Leyden Congregational Church, Brookline, Mass., is so competent a linguist and so sympathetic with Barth's essential message, that the English reader may be sure that he is meeting the author of the original addresses.

The Word of God and the Word of Man must be read as a collection of addresses delivered at different times and on different occasions. Barth himself explains:

The subjects of these addresses are almost all supplied and to some extent defined by the organizers of the gatherings before which they were delivered. If, in spite of this, the collection may still be called a whole, it is by virtue of an inner unity.

The inner unity is the insistence upon the grace of God and the need of man, the timeless message of Christianity. There is no ordered logic in the book as a whole, or even in the addresses. His religious passion cannot be confined by definition. His burning conviction tolerates no formal reasoning, but breaks forth into assertions to which the devoutly religious, reared in Christian communities, at once assent. A reviewer

describes the book quite accurately, "The immense paradoxes in *The Word of God and the Word of Man* fall upon civilization like the blows of a club." One of the charms of the book is its paradoxes. It solves no problems, but states them. Sometimes they have the effect of a "blow from a club"—they daze and bewilder—sometimes they make the stars appear, and after recovery from the blow, the stars become the focus of attention; sometimes they hurt, they disturb our notions of morality and religion, and this is their value. So that it is not strange that another reviewer remarks, "If we would understand the deepest problems of Christendom, we must meet Karl Barth."

Probably an aid to understanding Barth and the amount of literature gathering about his name, both "Barthian" and "anti-Barthian," is the suggestion that he is living in a "depressed" Germany. The word crisis often drops from his lips and flows from his pen. He and his hearers and readers have witnessed a crisis. They are in a strange new world. They did not make it, it came upon them. As a religious man he finds the explanation in God and in human sin. The Bible itself is a "crisis-literature." The prophets were always living in a "critical" time. The New Testament is the product of the greatest crisis in human history. Barth is a Biblical critic, a historian, a theologian of the twentieth century. He cannot escape the results of modern thinking, yet he cannot go back to the Bible, nor to Augustine, nor to Calvin. Nor can he escape the God who raised up the makers of Biblical and Christian history. Barth himself reached the place where one of his readers says his book led him, "to the outer edge of reality, where there is nothing left but himself and the gracious yet dreadful sovereignty of God."

The lectures are so much the product of a penetrating preacher interpreting his time to his contemporaries, that the apocalypticist, the mystic, the rationalist, the social reformer—all will find in *The Word of God and the Word of Man* congenial anchorage for their faith.

To give the contents of the volume should be sufficient to evoke the desire to read it. It contains the following addresses:

The Righteousness of God.

The Strange New World Within the Bible.

Biblical Questions, Insights, and Vistas.

The Need and Promise of Christian Preaching.

The Problem of Ethics Today.

The Word of God and the Task of the Ministry.

The Doctrinal Task of the Reformed Churches.

The Christian's Place in Society.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Values, a Bird's-Eye View. ROBERT MACKINTOSH, D. D. Independent Press, Ltd. Memorial Hall, E. C. 4, London.

THE fresh and engaging concept in philosophy and theology, "Value," is here treated; the reader being cautioned to remember, not in its nature but in detail. There follows a treatment comprehending Utility Values, Economic and Pleasure Values, Feeling, Health, Knowledge, Æsthetic and Moral Values, and "The Holy" and Religious Values.

There may be many differences of opinion as to the value of this study in detail of the various values; but none concerning the simple, direct, and clear discussion or the lucidity of style which make attractive reading. See this from the chapter on Pleasure Values:

Altruism, the favorite humanitarian watchword, may perhaps be pardonable rhetoric, but it is misleading as ethic or as philosophy. Not the extinction but the elevation and expansion of personal interest—not the surrender of value, but the service and enjoyment of a common good—is our high calling.

He inclines to argue that Ritschl's assertions (his doctrine inherited from Lotze), that all values, the highest as well as the lowest, are sensed subjectively as pleasures (near to hedonism), are correct but trivial. "The word which most properly belongs to the vocabulary of religion is joy—not pleasure and not even happiness, but joy." This in the chapter on Feeling Values, in which he vehemently rejects Pragmatism—more with vehemence than with logic we might say.

He reasons that Kant (thinking of knowledge values) is wholly agnostic, and leaves us no way to attain to real reality. Knowledge is non-suited on both counts by Kant who offers us a lower knowledge as orderly and serviceable, but it does not get through to real realities. And our metaphysical knowledge makes a desperate grasp at highest truths but is not really knowledge at all.

These few hints from the chapters on Moral Values and "The Holy" and Religious Values must suffice as a compelling invitation to the reader interested in this valuable study.

Moral value takes up into itself and recapitulates all lower values; so that now for the first time their significance shines out. . . The proposal to establish a scientific frontier—on one side of which everything shall be moral and nothing religious; while on the other side everything shall be religious and nothing moral—is senseless talk . . . righteousness stands highest of all among the values of this or any possible universe.

And once more:

But moral values and moral values above all others claim to mean personal relationship and therefore stand for personality both in man and God. . . Religion

will inevitably personify—but the religion which suspects that it is only personifying, and that the divine Friend is only a picturesque fiction, will do its work far less effectively than a religion which knows God.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

Henri Bergson. JACQUES CHEVALIER, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Grenoble. New York: The Macmillan Company.

BACK in the pre-World-War days, when translations of the philosophical work of Bergson and Eucken were first making Americans acquainted with the new philosophies, we were all tempted to make hasty inferences as to the religious implications of their systems; especially that of Bergson. Some of us were warning against a too easy inference in this matter, having lived long enough to know that in like instances founders of schools of thought had repudiated like inferences as to the religious implications of their philosophy.

The publishers of this volume pique our interest by announcing that Bergson never developed the religious implications of his philosophy, but that in this volume Chevalier does so, with the benefit of Bergson's personal counsel beforehand and his full approval when his work was completed.

The reader, however, must not look for a tabulated record of these interests, since while the religion implications are presented, it is in a completing and fulfilment of the essentials of Bergson's philosophy that they appear. We have an expounding of Bergson's whole philosophy (none too easily understood) in all its bearings; a philosophy to which its full value has not yet been assigned and too often criticized by those who have not labored to study it through or have not understood it and its involvements. Here is an aid in brevity, conciseness, and perspicuity to such, and almost a guarantee that they may understand as they read.

One could not, indeed, should not, pretend to, present in any brief, or even longer review, the list of these religious implications. Many of them could not well be formulated: they must be sensed; and, as implications, would not appear logical without their context. They belong to the body of the thought and as members cut out or off their context would appear as hands or feet or head dismembered. Reality is such that it cannot be intellectualized or if so presented cannot be known. Only its symbol would stand, the reality eluding us. It is such that it can be known only as it is entered into and experienced. Reality is a matter of spiritual and moral "interiority" and must be approached by sympathetic "intuition"—or affinity. "It has appeared to us" writes Chevalier (of course interpreting Bergson), "that there are two ways of knowing,

from within and from without, and that true knowledge, the knowledge absolute . . . of all things is inside knowledge." This is philosophy of course—and mysticism: if by mysticism we mean a certain appeal to an inner and profound life. "All philosophy is mystic."

Yet something may be said of these religious implications of Bergson's thought. Without being written as a theistic argument, or explicitly mentioning God, it offers the philosophical basis of a radical theism; not prepared or thought through to prove the immortality of the soul it presents the ground and indisputable reason for that faith; not proposing to reach a religious conclusion it creates a world view in which the reality of mind and soul as primary, and a spiritual interpretation of life and the world are necessary both as postulate and conclusion. Here we find reasoning and demonstration of the reality of freedom, and the "factuality" of human will, as in no modern work of philosophy otherwise even dreams; and here as noble a conception of duty as it has been our privilege to find in any work of philosophy—"something that comes from the depth of the soul which is able to introduce us to a higher world" or "In turning toward God and loyally obeying the Creative Impulse which is the core of our being itself, in submitting to the will of the Master who created us and calls us to collaborate with Him, we see within and without us new beams of light which reveal new depths to our existence, give fresh and clearer knowledge of its source, its destiny and the *mission* assigned to it, etc."

One hardly resists making many quotations from these three hundred thirty-one pages but must be content with the closing paragraph.

Truth to be known demands of man that he shall turn toward her: she demands from each of us the transformation of self. He who has been converted himself is more apt at the work of converting others. Therefore, because he has been converted himself to truth, and has always followed where she led, Bergson has taught mankind a new way of viewing things. He has provided it with fresh reasons for faith and hope: he has imparted to our minds a fresh impetus toward truth.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

Wings, 1927, republished in 1928 as **Wings of the Spirit**. Companion volume, **Windows and Wings**, 1928. GORDON HURLBUTT. Louisville: The Standard Press. 350 pp. each. \$3.00 per volume.

It requires courage to undertake the publication of a book of illustrations for the use of the preacher, or other public speaker. Such volumes are generally worthless, or worse. The man who employs such labors under two severe temptations, first to present warmed-over food, and second, to palsy his own originality and homiletic gift.

These volumes, however, are different. Their maker wrote thousands of ministers requesting of each, one or two of his best illustrations, born of actual life. From the great mass of material thus gathered, Doctor Hurlbutt, after extensive editorial retouching, compiled these two beautiful books. Their brief, story illustrations possess therefore the warmth, diversity, and vigor of real life. This fact alone puts the work in a class by itself.

Illustrations used reflect every shade and hue of theological opinion. We do not object to this, in fact we think it of value since they represent a cross-section of religious thought and opinion.

While we admit a reluctance to become enthused over any such volume, yet honesty compels the admission that superiority is found in *Wings of the Spirit* and *Windows and Wings*. Who wishes such a collection will find here the best yet published—and likely as good as can be published.

WILLIAM R. McNUTT.

Foreign Missions Under Fire. CORNELIUS HOWARD PATTON. Boston: The Pilgrim Press. 1928. Pp. 180. Cloth, \$1.00; paper, 60 cents.

DOCTOR PATTON is the Home Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Congregational). As author he writes from wide acquaintance with the facts both as to missionary achievements, and the criticism leveled at the missionary enterprise.

The author notes the storm of criticism, from many sources and states his purpose, "I have attempted in these pages to deal with the modern critics in face-to-face fashion, and, in so far as the limits of a short treatise make possible, to endeavor to answer their numerous complaints." The method employed by the writer is that of dialog. For instance the first chapter is entitled "The Lawyer." The conversations take place in "The Yale Club, New York City" between "a Lawyer, who is counsel for a prominent exporting company, and his classmate, the Secretary of a Board of Foreign Missions with headquarters in Boston. Time, January, 1928."

Chapters, each of which is followed by a reprint of current criticisms and discussions, bear these headings, "The Lawyer," "The Business Man," "The Pastor," "The Chairman" [of a local church missionary committee], "The College Student," "The Editor."

We pronounce this a timely, dignified, and constructive defense of one of the most hopeful movements of modern times.

WILLIAM R. McNUTT.

Church Finance. WILLIAM H. LEACH. Nashville, Tenn.: Cokesbury Press. 1928. Pp. 225. \$2.75.

THE well-known editor of *Church Management* gives us herewith one of the best books yet produced in this field.

The approach is made from the angle of the philosophy of stewardship, without an acceptance of which the work of the church will never be adequately financed. With its basic principle, "All that I hold is God's," it reverses completely the unchristian dictum, "All that I possess is mine." Let the church accept the former, boldly challenging her own members and the world with its validity, and she will thereby both solve her own financial difficulties and teach wisdom to all mankind.

The main portion of the book is given to the compilation of a vast amount of most valuable data as to methods which have been or are now being successfully employed by the churches relative to financing the local and the Kingdom work. A few of the fifteen chapters give indication of valuable content: "Application of Stewardship to the Local Church," "The Every-member Canvass," "Money for the New Building," "Endowments," "These Worked for Others," and "Giving as Worship."

The library of the parish worker will be incomplete without this volume; it is worth \$10 to the practical man.

WILLIAM R. McNUTT.

Enlisting Laymen. FREDERICK A. AGAR. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1928. Pp. 100. \$1.00.

A CHALLENGE to laymen in the churches to lay hold of organization, program, and management, with the definite purpose of making all these vital and productive. The author talks in a most straight-from-the-shoulder fashion (possibly too much so) about much non-productive or idling machinery, and about questionable items of polity, all of which need the layman's earnest thought and attention. In other words it is a need, a desperate need like a critical sickness, which entreats the men of the churches.

Let them not spend time seeking for New Testament models, which are not, but rather let efficiency be introduced all along the line in order to attain New Testament goals. Let them get things done.

The fact must be faced by laymen that the average member of the average church is making no serious attempt to be obedient in large fashion to the Head of the church. The lack of personal service, the abundant excuses for stinginess in monetary support, the absence of any disciplinary

policy for meeting profligate indifference, the too frequent absence of love among the disciples, these are all glaring revelations of a need worthy of earnest laymen's attention.

It is really a serious question if the church be not in grave danger of death from within, in danger of suicide by a policy of bootlegging and nullification in the realm of spiritual realities. The lack of rugged honesty and downright sincerity challenges all the devotion laymen possess.

The author's concluding chapter is entitled "Suggestive Programs," thus saying, "I have bared before you, Mr. Layman, the great need for your contribution, and here is the way to go about making it."

It is a vital book, dealing with vital issues, with ungloved hands. Every layman who cares ought to read it; every board of deacons and board of trustees ought forthwith to put a copy (at church expense) in the hands of each of their members. If they are worthy of being on such boards they will receive light and urge.

WILLIAM R. McNUTT.

Trouble. JEFF D. RAY. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1929. Pp. 80. \$1.00.

A GREAT pulpiteer, reviewing his public ministry, exclaimed that were he living his life again, he would preach more sermons of comfort. Verily there is, in our old world, a deal of sorrow; and whoever ministers thereto with healing touch truly does God's service.

"Trouble" is more than a pen creation; it is a heart product. The author is Professor of Practical Theology in Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and this fact urges our attention to this volume. We sense, however, its worth by virtue of imagination's hearing Doctor Ray saying with the poet,

I walked a mile with Sorrow,
And ne'er a word said she;
But, oh, the things I learned from her
When Sorrow walked with me.

We do not have here a philosophical treatise on human suffering; it is wholly practical and devotional in approach. The Book is applied to the wounded and beaten, as were oil and wine on the Jericho road. Like sweet ointment to the troubled heart is the Word of God.

The good pastor who maintains a shelf in his library, from which he selects now one volume and now another, as likely to meet a friend's need today, may add "Trouble," with profit.

WILLIAM R. McNUTT.

Church Leadership: A Journal for Laymen Who Lead. Vol. I, 1, January, 1929. Published quarterly by the Church World Press, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

WILLIAM H. LEACH has won the favor of such a large ministerial clientele for the magazine *Church Management*, that he has ventured to offer Christian laymen a sounding-board against which they can interpret their part in parish work. *Church Leadership* has made its bow as an attractive sixty-eight page periodical. The editor is not only a good manager, but he is also a very effective salesman. He knows the art of parceling ecclesiastical suggestion in such attractive form that men welcome his wares. His policy is to provide a magazine "written by laymen," "non-denominational," "spiritually-minded and constructive." Women are not overlooked. One of the best articles in the maiden copy treats "The Status of Women" in the local church. While this magazine promises to do a needy work in presenting the better mechanics of modern churchmanship, it is doubtful if it can enter the more urgent field of helping laymen rethink the function of the church in community life. For what doth it profit a church if it gain much enthusiasm and efficiency for its cause, if that cause is ill-defined?

STEWART G. COLE.

The American College and Its Rulers. J. E. KIRKPATRICK. New York: New Republic, Inc. 1926. Pp. viii, 309.

College or Kindergarten? MAX McCONN. New York: New Republic, Inc. 1928. Pp. 275.

Undergraduates: A Study of Morale in Twenty-three American Colleges and Universities. R. H. EDWARDS, J. M. ARTMAN, GALEN M. FISHER. New York: Doubleday, Doran. 1928. Pp. x, 369.

THESE three publications provide information upon phases of higher education that are very much to the fore in American thought at the present time. Collegiate training is becoming increasingly popular throughout the country, imposing heavy burdens upon college administrations, upon educational theory, and upon the social morale of the student center. Each of the texts lends itself to one of these important questions.

Professor Kirkpatrick is particularly concerned about the undemocratic methods of college executives and the resulting misplaced emphases in youth education. A president has no right to rule a school! Absentee government, whether resting in a trustee board of wealthy business men, of political "notabilities," or of reprehensible and absurd alumni is just as unfit for academic control. These men who possess the directive reins have broken faith with early American traditions in Massachusetts and Virginia and have introduced régimes that make schools servile to "the

powers that be." The youthful intellect lacks liberty and the human spirit power under this condition. To illustrate his contention, the author traces briefly in chapter studies the history of such important types as Harvard, William and Mary, Princeton, Clark, Amherst, Antioch, and several others, pointing out the steps at which schools have risen or fallen in purpose as they have treated this question democratically or otherwise. The government of a college should be in the hands of those who teach and study, as it was formerly in America and as it still is in large measure in Europe. A cabinet executive of resident schoolmen know their business better than any other class and should be given complete charge of the institution. These leaders would be directly responsible to their colleagues, who in turn would control their election. While the author has discovered much evidence to support his position, the reader cannot help feeling that there is a strong undercurrent of propaganda in the book.

Dean McConn, of Lehigh University, has had close dealings with a large student constituency during his years of office administration. This intimate acquaintance with youth has confirmed his mind that three types of young persons enter the campus; a goodly number who desire training in a "trade," whether mechanics, law, medicine, or what not; a minority who have a deep thirst for higher learning in the arts and sciences; and a majority who seek a "cultural" experience during their immature years in an athletic and socially approved atmosphere. The first group require "trade" schools; the second "real" colleges, and the third "superkindergartens." The author divides his attention between the last two. "Gentlemen" there will be who promote football and fraternities at the expense of true learning; these need academic provision, but not at the expense of men and women who desire scholarship, as is now the universal condition. The latter group receive the benefit of the dean's experience in a rather carefully wrought out exposition of the coming school in which "the promotion of scholarship and the intellectual life" get due recognition. He submits the curriculum, the technique, the type instructor, college "life," the administration, and kindred themes to careful and sympathetic investigation in order to rebuild an institution which he claims is "practicable" and indeed urgent in the plaintive need of our time.

The Institute of Social and Religious Research employed a small group of men and women to study the human element in campus activities, with the resulting publication, *Undergraduates*. The workers were well qualified for the task. They resorted to interview (1,100 such) with administrative, faculty, religious, athletic, and student leaders in an effort to tap reliable sources of youth experience. The materials are organized

in terms of the direct reports of the interviewees under such headings as: Student groupings, extra-curricular activities, athletics, men and women, honor system, religious agencies, the faculty, etc. The degree of reliability of the tabulated information for the original purpose of the study, is left to the judgment of the individual reader. A wide variety of opinions has been registered in the published documents. A reader can defend any prejudice which he harbors in reference to the moral conditions in collegiate centers by selecting source material to support his beliefs. Take, for example, the reports of relations of men and women; the optimist will prove that sex conditions were never more fitting; the pessimist will make as fair an argument for his conviction. In other words, there are several fundamental weaknesses in the method of publication of the findings. The subjective element stands out preeminently without any general evaluation on the part of the authors. The opinions of students, faculty members, and other leaders are related in sequence without sufficient reference to place, circumstance, time, or event. Besides, the material was over four years old before it was published. Names of schools, towns, and personalities have been concealed, which adds to the questionable virtue of the method, though safeguarding the reputation of the institutions. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, the authors have gathered a rich fund of material bearing upon the life of academic youth that may well provide a basis for further inquiry and experimentation in this wholesale business that has caught up the imagination of so large a company of American people.

STEWART G. COLE.

A Son of the Bowery. CHARLES STELZLE. New York: George H. Doran Co. 1928. Pp. 335. \$3.50.

"THE EAST SIDE of New York has been synonymous with depravity," the writer begins his autobiography. Before the reader has followed him through many pages, he learns that at least one widow mother in this tenderloin district succeeded in raising a family advantageously, and that her oldest son, Charles Stelzle, willed to become a figure of national importance in civic, industrial, and religious interests. He rehearses his life history through succeeding periods of abject poverty, night schooling, machinist apprenticeship, ministerial training, religious leadership, social engineering, as one round of brilliant endeavor after another, until many leaders in church, labor, business, and state sought his counsel and direction. Mr. Stelzle is a member of the Machinists' Trade Union and a Presbyterian minister; he is a traveling evangelist and a much-sought arbitrator in labor-capital disputes; he introduced Labor Sunday to

America, and organized the Labor Temple (Church) in New York City, an institution which has won highest praise and bitterest condemnation from adverse "schools" of Christians throughout the country.

Naturally the personal pronoun stands out prominently. More so than necessary, the reviewer thinks, for the distinct superiority of the man's accomplishments in so many important fields of human endeavor give sufficient prominence to the person involved. Such records of achievement as are portrayed in this volume make the best of source material for youth who are favored with much happier surroundings in life than was the writer, but who rarely rise to corresponding levels of self-enlistment. To date in America, a boy does not need to be born great to become a great man.

STEWART G. COLE.

Fireside Talks for the Family Circle. ALBERT W. BEAVEN. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1928. Pp. 143.

DOCTOR BEAVEN has given considerable attention to the place of the family in his church's program. This book is a report on some of the experiments which his people conducted under the direction of "The Commission on Religion and the Home." In strictly inspirational style the author relates episodes that make for happiness and understanding within the family circle. Most of the material has been published previously in various Baptist periodicals.

STEWART G. COLE.

Cycles of Time and Seasons—Based on the Reproduced Ancient Hebrew Calendar. G. C. SAVAGE. Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 1928. Pp. 203. \$2.50.

THIS book is of interest because of its authorship. Doctor Savage reports himself for *Who's Who in America* as an ophthalmologist. He has long taught in his special field as well as practised his profession. While a specialist in that direction he has been interested in church work and in Bible study. The latter interest has so developed that it has really subordinated his professional science.

In his Preface he explains that for several years prior to 1913 he had given much study to the Jewish Passover and to other Biblical feasts. He states that in 1913 he observed for the first time that the Christian Easter and the Jewish Passover were separated by thirty days. This prompted him to make an extensive study of Hebrew chronology, especially the ancient calendar. The volume now issued is an outgrowth of the author's study prompted by that discovery.

The volume is largely composed of charts presenting the author's conclusions concerning the Hebrew calendar, the Julian calendar and the Gregorian calendar, indicating relationships between these and conclusions which offer themselves to Doctor Savage. Accordingly, the book is primarily perhaps a reference compilation for students of the history of chronology and especially of calendar arrangements and dates.

The work is of further interest because the author points out in his preface that "This book should appeal to the farmer, in that it shows him the safe planting-time of spring and the safe gathering-time of autumn for any year of time." He illustrates by means of a chart how his conclusions are verified from actual weather records at different points in the United States. He suggests further that the volume will be useful to the lawyer who "will find that the Perpetual Seasonal Calendar will enable him to find the week-day of any dated event given him by his clients; and it will also give him the correct date of any fixed week-day that may be named by his clients." Other uses of the volume, particularly in the field of New Testament, as the author has studied New Testament chronology, are indicated.

The preface closes with expression of the hope that what the author has given "may help defeat the adoption of the Liberty, or some other 13-month calendar, as the world-calendar of the future."

It will thus be seen that the work of Doctor Savage should be of real interest to those who are giving attention to the history of the calendar or to changes which may be made in calendar arrangements for the future.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

An Introduction to the Teaching of Jesus. EARL EDMON SPEICHER, Ph. D. (Chicago). Boston: Richard G. Badger, Publisher. The Gorham Press. 1929. Pp. 127.

Too largely has Jesus' teaching been overshadowed by theological and ecclesiastical interests which have veiled his significance as a promulgator of a new way of living. In the judgment of Professor Speicher, of Northland College, "a new day will dawn for the Church and the world when the teaching of Jesus is made central and fundamental in the Christian program for a redeemed world." And the day will dawn only when the psychologists—or at least those who have a psychological approach—rally to the aid of the historians. These latter have done much, but they are hampered by working with tools developed for specific problems. What we need is a psycho-historical approach, a new methodology. Is this to imply that these artisans have tools so tempered that they are alike valuable for all tasks?

Just wherein this psycho-historical approach differs from its less ambitious and unhyphenated brother is not quite clear. Does it mean that a modicum of common sense is to be employed, and that we are to approach the teaching of Jesus, as the author finely phrases it: "But however one might desire Jesus to have taught, the only legitimate question for a New Testament student is: What did Jesus actually teach?" That is, are we to try to rediscover Jesus? If so, yes. However impossible the task may be, we must ever attempt it. But this is the province of history, or should be, not of psychology. It is conceivable—though perhaps not easily imaginable—that after the historian has produced some fairly probable reconstruction that will stand tests, the psychologist may be of value in consultation as to the proper next step, but it is clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt that of all the pathetic displays we have recently been called upon to endure few have been more heartrending than that where the psychologist, whose ignorance of the Bible and of its criticism is usually abysmal, comes clattering in with his diagnoses and exhibitions of technique. This latter usually consists of discovering vitally important clinical material for the psychology of Jesus in texts which a seminary junior would blush to use.

As a matter of fact the good things in this little volume—and they are many—are due to the historical, not the psychological, insight of its author. His desire to reveal the "environment"—the spelling is no doubt the typesetter's—in which the new teaching arose, and to focus attention where it belongs, namely on the personality of Jesus, are not only to be commended but are capitably done, and are sufficient in themselves to make the book worth reading. This, however, is the historian. Shall we say that the quite occasional discussion and use of material for aiding a rediscovery of the personality of Jesus, followed by a foot-note or parenthesis to the effect that the authenticity of the incident so used is questionable or improbable, is the technique of the psychologist? If so, the psychologist needs sit at the feet of the historian!

After cleansing this little volume of its overdose of psychological jargon and the futuristic spelling *thru*, and at least raising the question whether "psycho-historical" might not have been rendered simply "historical," a very interesting and valuable residue is left.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

Victim and Victor. JOHN RATHBONE OLIVER, author of *Fear*, etc. New York: The Macmillan Company.

THOUGH this book has no direct connection with *Fear*, the author's earlier work, there is, he writes, an element of continuity that associates one

book with the other. He has had suggested to him to work out a type of priest-physician to deal with patients of the psychasthenic order in a more effective way than either priest or physician might in his separate sphere. Apparently this appalls him, and he is content to imagine one of each kind, who might *together* treat such patients.

For a change the "clergyman" of fiction is neither a despicable sinner, nor a sleek-visaged saint. Thoroughly human in his own defects, these defects aid him in aiding others. This is a literary value of the book not to be despised. The physician, though not without individuality, has the usual sanity ascribed to such, and in treating others together they seem to have been of value to each other.

Those interested in pathological cases will here find many worth-while studies, and recognize, perhaps, that if they wish to treat such among their patients, their parishioners, or their friends, these pages have wisdom for them. One thing is sure—there are no dull pages for one who is interested in the most fascinating of all subjects, his human kind; and he may be tempted to think he also might help folks in some such way rather than with the bare generalities of ethics.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

Man in the Making. STROTHER A. CAMPBELL. Boston: The Gorham Press. 1929. Pp. 103.

THERE is a triple pleasure in reviewing Mr. Campbell's book: he is a young author, worthy of encouragement, he is a son of Crozer, and he has done an excellent piece of work.

Man in the Making is a series of sermon-addresses, the first of which gives title to the book. These number eleven in all. They hang together in progressive sequence. Their message is finely cumulative. Their style is direct, racy, fascinating; we could not lay it aside until the last word had been read.

God says, "Let us make man." He will furnish blueprint and material, but man has the contract. And he must build, not the physical only, but see to it that his creation has heart and soul.

Man's most neglected kingdom is that which lies between his own crown and sole. It is one thing to seize and rule kingdoms without; man must learn to capture and rule the one within.

"How Much Do You Weigh?" You cannot find out by standing on your-exact-weight scales. Not every heavyweight is a real man. You must find some method of weighing the moral qualities before you can answer the question. Morals really weigh more than all else.

"I'm not gonna play," sulks the boy on the vacant lot. So say all too many, both young and old. When we have made a real man he will play the game of life without flinching or fouling.

So run the cleverly written, finely illustrated chapters to the end. Number XI brings us face to face with "The Man We Need to Know." Man needs, as he makes himself, a Man-Model—this chapter stands Him in the midst.

The volume carries a message needed by most of us; it has, however, a peculiar value for young people. Were I a pastor again I should place it on that shelf to which my young friends hold the key. To them it will be bread.

WILLIAM R. McNUTT.

THE January number of *The Madras Christian College Magazine* has been received, addressed to the Editor of THE CROZER QUARTERLY. The articles are almost wholly in the English language and present an excellent variety of interesting discussions, such as "Brotherhood," "The Æsthetic Attitude," "New Darkness on the Life of Shakespeare." This number is Vol. IX of the Quarterly Series, No. 1.